

# INFANTS not the Subjects of Christian Baptism:

O R

and Twenty *Arguments*, plainly proving  
that *Infants* ought not to be *Baptized*.

A N D

the Practice of *Baptizing* Infants, is not only  
arrantable by the *Holy Scriptures*, but a mani-  
Contradiction to them, and also to the Sense  
Practice of the Primitive Christians in the  
and purest Ages of the G O S P E L,

A L S O

Godfathers and Godmothers, or other *Sureties* for  
performance of a *Covenant* made for Infants at  
Baptism, are *Unscriptural* and consequently  
arrantable.

---

j. 21. *Prove all things, and hold fast that which is Good.*

is not read in the *Holy Scriptures*, nor may be proved  
is not to be received as an Article of Faith or as any  
essary to Salvation. *The Sixth of the 39 Articles of the Church*  
d.

ism was not known in the World the two first  
after *Christ*, in the third and fourth it was ap-  
by a F E W, at length in the fifth and follow-  
ges, it began to obtain in divers Places; and  
we observe this *Rite* indeed as an antient  
, but not as an *Apostolical Tradition*. *Curcellanus's*  
the Christian Religion, *Book 1. Chap. 12. Sect. 4.*

---

D U B L I N:

by *Sylvanus Pepyat*, Bookseller in *Skinner-*  
*Row.* 1732.

R

V

ed be obse  
pressed t  
from  
may j  
have fo  
who i  
fermab  
e way  
ow, but  
from  
of tha  
deratio  
their o  
d and  
51. 6.  
uredly,  
at not hi  
nowledge  
or Tru  
we may  
Opinion,  
ssary, t  
not con  
ffile t  
usly ap  
ould be  
rm his  
rife and  
ers of R  
contrar  
g he has  
nds be r  
be Ju  
r Error  
uth, it  
ation an



# TO THE READER.

**W**HEN the Words of Solomon are duly consider'd, Prov 23. 23. Buy the Truth and sell it not ; We shall be oblig'd to own, that Truth was in the Judgment of that great and wise man, a Jewel of such inestimable worth, that it shou'd be purchased at any Rate, and parted with at none. It is to be observed, that our blessed Saviour whilst he was here on Earth, express'd the highest esteem for Truth, shewing us, that it was part of his Mission from Heaven to become a Witness in it's Favour. John 18. 37. We may justly infer, that on our part it is highly reasonable, that the Love we have for Truth, should bear some Proportion to that Esteem we profess for him, who is himself the very Truth of God, and whose Design and Design is conformable to the Will of his glorious Father ) to guide us poor Mortals in the way of Truth, unto whom it would be very pleasing, that we did not only know, but also acknowledge all Truth.

From Rom. 2. 8. 9. that Indignation and Wrath shall be the Portion of that man, who is contentious and disobedient to the Truth : a Consideration of which, should engage the thoughtful to act very cautiously in their opposing of Truth, they be found to fight against God himself, and will espouse the Cause of it. Isaiah 59. 13 to 15. Jer. 9. 51. 6. Acts 5. 38. 39.

Surely, all the knowing among men will allow, that Truth is but one, and that nothing can be true which is in contradiction to it ; and it should be acknowledged with Concern, that in our most diligent and best design'd Search after Truth, we are most miserably divided even in those Determinations, which we may probably think do most justly result from them.

In Opinion, all Parties will agree in this Conclusion, viz. that it is unnecessary, that every Man should be fully persuaded in his own Mind, and should not condemn himself in the thing which he allows. And in respect of the Light in us may be Darkness, we should highly esteem, and carefully apply ourselves to all probable means of Knowledge, for fear we should be falsely persuaded ; for every honest man accounts himself obliged to conform his words and Actions to the persuasion of his Mind, as believing it to be a great evil for any man to be unfaithful to his own Light ; and of Religion wherein the Conscience is more especially concern'd to be contrary to the Sentiments or Language of Conscience or the best Light he has. Besides it beboves us to be more than ordinary careful, that we be not falsely persuaded ; because the Persuasion of the Mind is the Foundation of the Judgment, either upon a right or wrong Foundation, either right or Error. If the Judgment be fix'd upon a right Foundation, and if it be true, it will be to our greatest Advantage. But if it fixes on a wrong Foundation and is wrapped up in Error, it will be to our greatest Detri-

ment ; Since it is evident that the Government of the Affections is seated in the Judgment, so that where the Judgment is sound, and Reason and Will are both in subjection to it, the man who thus submits to the Government of a sound Mind, or a well-enlightened Understanding into the most acceptable Words and Actions.

A sound Mind or Judgment, is a Mind which is rightly persuaded of great worth, and much to be esteemed ; it is of greater worth than all that add than the whole world, in regard it yields a greater Profit than the Possession of the whole world could do. And surely it must be that a sound Mind or Judgment, is made up of the Knowledge of God, so that no man can be supposed to have a well persuaded mind, who is not acquainted with the Truth.

It may be admitted, that a man whose Judgment is very unsound, may adorn his Language, and dress up his Sentences with all that which lyes in Rhetorick it self ; yet surely all he says will be but a worthless Stuff, yea and much worse where it flows not from a sound Mind. For in the Judgment of every wise man it will amount to no more, than a well clad or dress'd up in a handsome Garment, set off to the best advantage, that it may insinuate it self into the good opinion of those, who shall receive it.

Most certain it is, that further than a man's words agree with the Truth, tho' he should speak like an Angel, and artfully make the best of a bad Cause ; all his fine words are but as the sounding of Brass, or a Cymbal ; and if what he doth be done knowingly, with a design to deceive the Truth, he is justly to be accounted one of the worst of men.

Every honest man of a well inform'd Judgment will readily see this Truth, viz. That it is much better for a man to embrace the Truth, dress'd up in Rags, than to countenance Error adorn'd with the most beautiful Garments which the utmost art of man can put upon it.

When any man from a real Concern for his own Happiness, shall be an Inquirer for Truth, it will becom him with the greatest Solidity to dwell upon the Inquiry, as one that is in love with, and has an earnest desire to find it : and not like Pontius Pilor to drop the Inquiry as soon as he can : For indifferency in a matter of such moment is very displeasing to the Mind of Christ, and will be a Lett to the Entrance of such a Soul into the Kingdom of Glory, in the Day when the righteous Nation which keep the Commandments of God shall enter in. See John 18 37. Isaiah 26. 2.

It is not every one can say with the Apostle Paul 2 Cor. 12 3. I should every one strive, to have it in our Power to say with him, I do nothing against, but for the Truth.

Those men who accustom themselves to think upon the most excellent things, may sadly observe, that that most excellent and valuable thing is not so common as but a few Friends, but a great number of Adversaries ; probably because they presently bring their Favourers to worldly Glory, the God of Truth bestows Honour better and more lasting for them. And it is much to be desired that the generality of Mankind are such dim-sighted Creatures, that they are not able to see as far off, or take a pleasing view of that Glory, to which they bring those in the world to come, who are the unfeigned Locusts of the Truth.

Solomon among other things remark'd, that many courted the Truth a

that the Rich had many Friends, whereas the Poor, ( notwithstanding much better than the Rich ) was at the same time hated of his Friends, and that because of his Poverty. And it may be one of our Observations, that as it was then, so it is now and likely to continue until the End of this world shall pass away.

David was in his Exile, and hunted by Saul as a Partridge upon the Mountains, he had but a few to side with him ; there were but a very few, who loved his righteous Cause ; but when Saul was dead, and divine Providence turned the Scale with a smile upon him, there came vast numbers of Men from all Quarters, to put him upon the Throne. Even so, when Jesus Christ, the Lord of Life and Glory, the Son of David and Son of Man, was in his State of Humiliation, he was had in Esteem but by a very few ; these too were for the most part of the poorer or common sort of People : Men of low Rank, the Honourable and Learned of the Nation of the Jews, rejected him, and very evilly entreated him, because of the meanness of his Appearance. They looked upon him as a Root springing out of a dry ground, and they saw not that Comeliness which might attract their Love, and draw forth their Admiration of him : For the Honour and Glory of this world, is the ascendant in their Affections ; walking more by Sight than by Faith, as we are all too inclinable to do.

The infinitely wise God purposely so orders it that as his Son did not, so shall his Truth make any great Figure in this World, that it may not be valued who it is that embraces it for its own sake, and most affectionately recommends it on its own Recommendation ; that hereafter it may be manifest to Men and Angels, who it is that doth both own and honour it in its own way. Men who act not upon such a base and ignoble Principle, do not receive their Compliments of Congratulation and Praise to it, when like the Sun it rises in Glory ; but despise it when it is generally despised, and turn their Faces from it when it is covered with dismal Clouds of Dishonour. There are too many by Thousands, by Millions among men, who are too much attached to the Friendship of this World, who will not believe that it is at enmity with God, or that he who is a Friend of this World, is an Enemy to God. It is vain for us to expect that multitudes in our Day should follow Christ, rather to suffer Affliction with the People of God for Truths sake, than to be in Friendship with this World, and enjoy the Pleasures of Sin. Men are so much taken up with the consideration of the Recompence of Reward, that they have not an Eye to the eternal Continuance, are at too great a Distance from the Kingdom of God, and worldly minded men, who seek Honour one from another, and not from God only. Men, who cannot believe, that Christ is greater Riches, than all the Treasures of this World. It may be certain, because the God of Truth who cannot lye, hath testified by his Word. 2 Pet. 2. 2. That some men would be covetous, and that Covetousness, the way of Truth would be evil spoken of, and despised : Through means whereof men's minds have been prepossessed with false judices against it, and also against the faithful Professors of it. In consideration, it's not to be expected, that Truth should meet with a ready Reception from any, but those whose minds are freed from Prepossessions.

Truth as it is in Christ Jesus, may meet with Acceptance from such

such Persons, whose minds are unbiass'd and pre-dispos'd to an honest and partial Inquiry after it : As believing that he who finds Truth, finds the choicest and most enriching Treasure. A Treasure which makes him rich in Time, and compleatly rich in Eternity. And therefore resolves to make a faithful Judgment of all that shall be offer'd on both sides of every Question, and that nothing shall determine his Judgment upon any Point, but clearness of evidence ; who will not pay a Regard to any Argument further than they shall be well supported by the word of God, and Reason confirm'd thereby, even such as carry the Force of Conviction to an unprejudic'd Mind. So that where and when ever Truth shall prevail it self upon the Evidence not to be gainsay'd, tho it should walk the Streets in Chains of Iron, and with a Crown of Thorns upon its Head, he will have his Arms open to receive it.

To such men as these the Truth shall be welcome, and to the Truth and to the God of Truth, shall such men as these be welcome : For these are men of honest Principles and so rarely to be found, that the Lord Jesus will have them in the highest Estimation, as more precious than the Wedge of Ophir. They shall know the Truth, and the Truth which only is known, shall bring them to everlasting Glory, and eternally make them happy. John 8. 31. 32.

Among the many Truths of God, which from time to time have been discover'd, through the Covetousness of worldly and evil minded men, the Truth and Practice of Water Baptism, may challenge the first Place. It can number the almost innumerable Corruptions which this great Ordinance of the Son of God hath suffered since the first Institution of it, both as to the Subject and Manner of its Administration.

Astonishingly strange are the Divisions which have been, and still are in the Christian World about it. To instance only in a few Particulars. Some who affirm, that Infants of eight Days old or less are the Subjects of it. Others as positively affirm ( and that not without the strongest Reason ) that Infants are not the Subjects of it at all.

Some affirm, that sprinkling a little water upon the Face, is the true way of Administring it. This way runs Rome and the most of the Nation here, since the thirteenth Century and second Council of Revena. Others, who as positively affirm, that the true way of Administring this Ordinance is by covering the Party Baptized all over in the Element of Water. This way went the whole Christian Church (saith Dr. Whitby) for many Hundred Years : This way went the Church of England (saith Dr. Floyer) until the Reign of James the first : This way goes the Church of England to this very Day, as both Dr. Whitby and others inform us, and according to Dr. Jeremiah Taylor Bp. of Down and Connor, is conformable to the Sense and Law of the Church of England (how contrary the Practice is) as will plainly appear from the Rubrick in King Edward's Time, if Sir John Floyer may be depended upon. And agreeable to the Opinion of many of the greatest Writers of the Church of England, as Arch-Bishop Tillotson, Dr. Barlow Bp. of Lincoln, Dr. Burnet Bp. of Salisbury, Dr. Fowler Bp. of Gloster, Dr. Jeremiah Taylor Bp. of Ely, and Connor, Dr. Wm. King Bp. of Londonderry and late Arch-Bishop of Dublin, Dr. Cave, Dr. Tupper, Dr. Hammond, Dr. Edwards, Dr.



erton Knatchbull, Sir John Floyer, Mr. Mead, Mr. Burket, Pole, and a Vast number besides of none of the smallest Reputation; by them this way go the Anabaptists, and that because it is the way to the Holy Scriptures direct them. A way of which they see no cause to be dam'd, in the Practice whereof they are under no necessity to creep into, being modestly confident, they are able by fair Reasoning, in the Debate, to engage any man who is disposed to controvert this Point with

affirm that the Sign of the Cross, Crame, Spittle, Salt, &c. should be the Administration of Baptism, this way runs Mystery Babylon, and are too nearly related to her; others there be, who as stiffly affirm these things are unwarrantable by Holy Scripture: this way go Presbyterians generally, and in which they agree with the Anabaptists, some Godfathers and Godmothers, others will have none——Oh wonder-

Surely all these Divisions should call for great Searchings of Heart in Christians, and the most diligent Search of Holy Scripture: Especially in all earnestly long for unity of Faith and Affections among them who profess to be the Son of God. All such should be most seriously intent in their inquiries for Truth, upon all Questions relating to this great Institution of the Gospel: And the rather because through the means of these Divisions, it is probable a great number of our Countrymen have been hurri'd into Contempt of it, and the most publick Protestations against it; making an Article of their Profession, that Water-Baptism is a useless thing, the Practice of it should be for ever laid aside, as a weak and beggarly thing. This way goe the Quakers, whose mistakes of Judgment about the Practice are much to be lamented.

It will be granted that Truth upon all possible simple Questions, is but one; that nothing can be true which is in Contradiction to it; if the Question be put, is Water-Baptism an Ordinance of the Gospel or not? the Answer stated is capable of receiving no Answer but one in Truth: And whether it be, it is, or it is not. And we must all own that if it be not, we are to continue it; but if it be, the Danger attends the Neglect of it upon the supposition that it is an Ordinance of Christ; if the Answer be, are Infants the Subjects of it, or are they not? the Answer which Truth must either be, that they are, or that they are not. If they be, it is dangerous to deny it them; but if they are not, the Danger lyes in giving

finding out of TRUTH upon this single Question, whether it be negative or the affirmative Answer, is the Design of the following Arguments. In the which, if I am mistaken, as it is not impossible I may be, at so great a Distance from that remarkable Spot in Italy, wherein it is said only to center, I say if I am mistaken, it is my hearty Desire that some man or other may discover my Mistake; may give such Arguments, and advance such others, as may be sufficient to convince me that I am mistaken, while I have an opportunity of doing so.

Every deed I am right, and the Truth lies on the negative side of the Question (as I at present believe it doth) then do I as heartily desire, that the Truth may accompany these Arguments with his Blessing to every inquiring



inquiring Soul, that they may carry such clearness of Evidence as may roughly convince all who oppose me, that the mistake stands on their side; this I am sure of (if I can be sure of my own Intentions) that it is knowledge of Truth I aim at, and thereby the Glory of Christ and my Neighbours Good.

I am of Opinion, I shall have few who will differ from me upon this point, viz. that whether I be right or wrong in the present Question, yet I am to speak as I think; and am (even as all other men) under a necessity to follow the Persuasion of my mind, to speak the Truth in my Heart to my Honour, and honestly express my inward Sentiments; for by so doing I (were I wrong) turn my self inside out, fairly shewing what my Persuasion is, and the Grounds thereof, to the Intent I may put it into the Power of those who oppose me well, to convince me or at least to perform the part of a kind Neighbour, endeavouring to convince me, that my mind touching this Point is not perswaded.

Into whose hands these Arguments will pass after they pass out of mine, I know not, nor doth my Ignorance in this Particular give me the least concern. I know they may probably fall into the hands of some who will be ready to judge before they think. From such men as these I expect no other than that a severe Sentence shall be speedily pass'd, and perhaps the whole condemn'd to the Flames before the half of them is read.

But where they fall into the hands of such, who will not pass Judgment till a fair Tryal and just Examination of all Evidences; from all such I promise my self tender Treatment, and will believe the Judgment they will express their inward Sentiments, and honestly arise from the Power of their Minds, altho after all, their Sentence may probably be the result of a mistaken understanding.

I can safely declare both with Lip and Pen, that I have a very tender regard for all sober men, whose way of thinking differs from mine; and for the establish'd Church, or any Denomination of Dissenters from her, whether Unitarian, Independent or Quaker, who are good natur'd men, and have no abhorrence of an angry persecuting Spirit, who can look pleasantly upon whose Persuasion of Mind differs from his, and would not hurt a Neighbour's Head, were it ever so much in his Power to do it: Such as always lies open to, and who resolves he will never stifle Conviction, cheerfully yields to Truth in all its Appearances, and with Pleasure corrects his Mistakes of his Judgment, as speedily as they come to his Knowledge; yet at the same time is most faithful to his present Conceptions, and does not prostitute his Conscience to any fleshly or worldly view, in concealing the Persuasion of his Mind, or refusing to make a Confession of that Faith which is fix'd in his Heart, thro' a slavish fear of disobliging any; he heartily resolves to the utmost of his Power to please God rather than man, and will not content himself with the Profession of what he believes without making a Confession of it; heartily designing the Benefit of his Profession to whom he makes that Profession.

Such a man as this I take to be an honest man, altho' I may be mistaken in his Judgment, perhaps in many Particulars.

But as for all such of what Denomination soever, who are ill-natur'd, cannot look pleasantly upon or entertain one favourable thought of

ters of Religion or Conscience dissent from, or are of a contrary Mind  
 ; who distinguish themselves (as some do) even in the Pulpit, as well  
 inate Conversation, in speaking evil of those who differ from them, as if  
 a secret Pleasure in bespattering their Characters ; especially the poor  
 ptilts, loading them with all the Reproach wherewith they can possibly  
 them ; moved by the flaming Zeal of a misinform'd and mis-guided  
 anding, which transports them not only beyond the bounds of Christianity,  
 Humanity also. Such an Antiscriptural and Roman Catholick like  
 shew'd it self in a solemn League and Covenant, made not many  
 Years since against the Arminians, Independants, Anabaptists, &c.  
 d not come into the same way of Thinking with them : such beady, high  
 Gentlemen as these, by what name soever they are call'd, tho' I am bound  
 them well, to pity the greatness of their Ignorance, and the madness of  
 rits, and to be always ready to perform any good Offices to them ; yet  
 the Baptists in general, may with Justice despise them, even as they  
 ed by them.

such men as these are mistaken upon any controverted Point, it is  
 an impossibility to fasten Conviction on them : For the Furioussness of  
 it, and the ungovernableness of their Passion, will not suffer them to  
 any Subject, as reasonable men ought to do So that they can neith-  
 to their own, nor speak to the Edification of other mens understanding.  
 therefore I cannot expect, that these Arguments against Infants  
 Baptism ; can have the desir'd Effect : For it is highly probable, they  
 serve as fresh Fuel to the Fire already kindled in their unsanctify'd  
 and make it blaze and flame the more ; but should it be so, I shall not  
 accountable, for Truth must be defended.

I conclude, as all things of this kind going into the World must be submit-  
 tance, or the Lot which shall be assign'd it, so must this. I re-  
 quing of any of my Readers, but that which any one of them is bound  
 to, viz. that they will bring these Arguments to the Test of Holy  
 and Reason rightly inform'd, and to weigh the whole in the even  
 of an unbiass'd and impartial Judgment ; and then I am content  
 may be at their Light within shall direct, that is, according to  
 suasion of their minds, and in which they have my good Wishes, that  
 spirit of God whose Office is to guide well disposed Souls into all Truth,  
 them to the most just and righteous Judgment : the mean while  
 ed in the Assurance of my honest Intentions in sending these Argu-  
 the World.

to those who know the Truth, to confirm and establish them in  
 ge of it.

to those who know not the Truth, but are willing to know it ;  
 their understandings, to assist their Enquiries and help them to the  
 of it.

them to those who know not the Truth, and are regardless whether  
 or not ; contenting themselves, in a state of Indifferency, as not  
 whether Truth or Error be uppermost ; to awaken them to a Godly  
 Christ and their own Souls, in a diligent Search for that, which  
 are carefully searched for than thousands of Gold and Silver,

I send them to those who know not the Truth, and being pre-ingenared to Notions, which have made the earliest Impressions upon them, and that Reason in which they have been educated, are pre-resolved they never will know anything in Opposition to it ; I say my Design is to leave them without

And now, that the Lord Jesus may have Glory, and that TRUTH fairly shine forth, is the unfeigned Desire of

Curteous Reader,

a real Friend to Truth, and a

Well Wisher to thy Soul,

Oswald Edwards



Infants not the Subjects of Christian Baptism.

T H E  
C O N T E N T S.

*Arguments.*

om a Sacrament as it  
is an outward Sign of  
rd Grace. page 1 to 4.  
m a Sacrament at it  
an Oath of Allegi-  
Christ .4. to 6.  
m the Necessity there  
those who receive a  
nt should converse by  
th the things which  
fy'd thereby. 6. to 8.  
m Infants being in-  
of Faith and Repen-  
oth which are justly  
of Persons to be  
8. to 10.  
n Infants want of  
o enter into a Cove-  
h God. 10 & 11.  
the Necessity there  
persons to answer a  
nficence to God in  
11. to 13.  
the unacceptable-  
all Acts in Religion

*Arguments.*

which spring not from Faith  
and Love. 13. and 14.  
8. and 9. From the Useless-  
ness of Baptism to Infants,  
both with respect to this,  
and the World to come. 22.  
to 31.  
10. From the want of a  
Warrant from the holy Scrip-  
tures for the Practice of bap-  
tizing Infants. 31 and 32.  
11. From the want of a  
Precept in Scripture expressly  
commanding it, or Precedent  
expressly shewing it to be the  
Practice of holy Men menti-  
oned therein, as also the  
want of Consequences fairly  
arising from Scripture in it's  
Favour. 32. to 37.  
12. From the Practice of  
baptizing Infants, being con-  
trary to the holy Scripture!  
37 to 39.  
13. From



*Arguments.*

13. From the holy Scriptures commanding an Action in the Party to be baptized, and speaking preceptively to them. 39 to 42.

14. From the baptizing of Infants being contrary to the Sense and Practice of the primitive Christians in the first and purest Ages of the Gospel. 42 to 45.

15. From its leading Christian Communities into Confusion, putting it out of their Power to know whether several of their Members were ever baptiz'd or not. 45. 46.

16. From its leading Protestant Communities to countenance the Superstitions of the Romish Antichristian Baptism. 46 to 49.

17. From its putting Christian Communities under a Necessity of casting away

*Arguments.*

Christian Discipline. 49.

18. From its putting persons baptiz'd under a necessity of growing worse after Baptism, than better, as the Scriptures require them to do. to 53.

19. From its putting persons under a Temptation to take up their Satisfaction where what was done for them in Infancy, without ever considering whether right or wrong. 53.

20. From its leading Christian Communities into inconsistency with the Scriptures. 53.

21. From its being contrary to the Doctrine of the Prophets and all the Apostles in that it makes Reason to consist in something short of true Christianity. 69 to 77.

*Some remarkable Parts of the Contents.*

GODfathers and Godmothers neither warranted by Scripture or Reason. 14 to 22.

Why were the Inventors of the 5th Century. 9. to 16.

Infants Baptism was first brought in on a Supposition

that they could not be saved without it, mistaking the Sense of our Lord's saying to *Nichodemus*, John 3. After Infants Baptism brought in, the latter Times grew more



## remarkable Parts of the Contents. iii

rd's Supper also, as  
g they could not be  
without it, from a mis-  
our Lord's Words,  
p. 31.

the Salvation of In-  
ing without either of  
aments, is not to be  
made evident, as  
by the Mercy of God  
the Merit of Christ,  
nd 23. to 25.

Covenant which God  
th *Abraham* and his  
is a spiritual Cove-  
d made with true  
as his spiritual Seed  
p. 67 and 68.

Right to Baptism  
inferred from that  
which *Abraham's*  
in the Covenant of  
which God made  
and them. p. 34.

can it be infer'd  
circumcising of In-  
er the Law, more  
Right to the Lord's  
be infer'd from  
t to the Passover  
Law. p. 34.

it be infer'd from  
Saying concerning  
at of such is the  
Heaven. p. 34.

Right to Baptism  
infer'd from the  
saying that they  
more than from

thence may be infer'd their  
Right to the Supper. p. 35.

Nor can their Right to  
Baptism be infer'd from the  
Apostles baptizing Households  
more than we may conclude  
their Right to the Lord's  
Supper, from whole House-  
olds eating the Passover un-  
der the Law. p. 35.

The great Possibility of  
Men's being mistaken about  
Consequences. p. 33

The God of Order hath  
appointed a beautiful Order  
to be observ'd in that Obe-  
dience we pay to him, each  
Duty following the other in  
a regular Succession; as first  
of all must come Conversion,  
or Regeneration, after that  
a professed Faith in Christ,  
next in proper Place and Or-  
der comes Water Baptism.  
p. 26 and 27.

Some Remarks on the  
Church of *Scotland's* Catechize  
saying, that the Children  
whose Parents are both, or  
but one of them Believers,  
are in Covenant, and have  
a Right to Baptism. p. 59  
to 62.

Remarks on the Church  
of *Scotland's* Catechize saying  
none out of the visible Church  
ought to be baptized, untill  
they profess Faith in and O-  
bedience to Christ. p. 65. & 66.

Infants



nt

ane 4

ter Ba

but

As c

nted

;

quen

aine

Conf

Sacra

heref

...ntic

rtie  
DIT

OW, 1  
5160

face  
the C

One C

# h3

an

an e

nts L

its  
is 20

is a  
the

पुनः, ३

going

1

no P

a r

1



## nts not the Subjects of Christian Baptism.

*Some Arguments against Infants supposed Right to*

# A P T I S M.

### Argument the First.

*Water Baptism* be a Sacrament, then Infants are not the Subjects; but *Water Baptism* is a Sacrament, therefore Infants are not Subjects of it.

anted by all Parties to the Question, that *Water Baptism* is a Sacrament; wherefore nothing in the Argument can be deny'd but the Consequence of the major, in Defence of which I further argue. A Sacrament be an outward Sign of an inward and spiritual Grace, the Consequence of the major is True.

A Sacrament is an outward Sign of an inward and spiritual Grace, therefore the Consequence of the major is True.

Parties do allow that *Water Baptism* is a Sacrament, so they allow, that a Sacrament is an outward Sign of an inward and spiritual Grace, and therefore they can deny no part of this Argument the Consequence of its major, for Proof of which I further

have not that inward and spiritual Grace, whereof a Sacrament is an outward Sign, then the Consequence of the major is

nts have not that inward and spiritual Grace, whereof a Sacrament is an outward Sign; therefore the Consequence of the major is false, and so the whole is true as was to be proved.

The foregoing Argument may otherwise be explained and stated

no Person has a right to *Water Baptism*, but such a Person has a right to it under the Notion of a Sacrament,

But a little Infant has no right to it under the notion of a Sacrament; therefore a little Infant has no right to *Water Baptism* at

Since as before observed, all Parties to the Question are agreed that *Water Baptism* is a Sacrament; it is thence evident, no this Argument can be deny'd but the minor, in support of which further argue.

Those Persons to whom *Water Baptism* cannot be administered so as that it should be in them, an outward Sign of an inward Spiritual Grace; they are such Persons, as to whom it cannot be administered under the notion of a Sacrament.

But *Water Baptism* cannot be administered to Infants, as an outward Sign of an inward and spiritual Grace.

Therefore Infants are such Persons, as to whom *Water Baptism* cannot be administered under the Notion of a Sacrament.

In Defence of the Minor Proposition of this Argument, which is the only part of it that will be deny'd, I further argue.

Those Persons who in the Judgment of discreet thinking Men cannot be suppos'd to have an inward and spiritual Grace, are such Persons as unto whom *Water Baptism* cannot be administered as an outward Sign of such Grace.

But Infants are such Persons who in the Judgment of discreet thinking Men, cannot be suppos'd to have an inward and spiritual Grace.

Therefore Infants are such Persons as to whom *Water Baptism* cannot be administered as an outward Sign of such Grace, as was before proved. And since Baptism is a Sacrament, and a Sacrament is an outward and visible Sign of an inward and spiritual Grace, it cannot be administered to them as a Sacrament, it will thence be evident, that Infants are not the Subjects of Christian Baptism, a very clear Demonstration. See the Church of England's Catechism, which defines a Sacrament, and the Assembly of Divines Confession, *Paragraph 21.* and their larger Catechism on the Parts of a Sacrament, and consider how the spiritual Relation, or Sacramental Union doth subsist, which is in every Sacrament between the Sign and the Thing signified; and judge whether either of the Parts can be separated, which it bears a spiritual Relation, and with which it is joined in a Sacramental Union; and then judge how *Water Baptism* can be administered as a Sacrament to an Infant, in whom there is not that inward spiritual Grace which is one part of the Sacrament, and which is join'd in a Sacramental Union with the outward and visible Sign, which composes or frames the Sacrament. See his Grace William, late Arch Bishop of Dublin in his *Inventions of Man in the World* wrote when he was Bishop of Derry p. 175. on the Parts of a Sacrament.

If the Doctrine of *Anabaptism*, with which we are fully satisfied, doth not make us better Protestants than others of our Communion, we are sure it doth not make us worse, as to this Particular of the Number of Sacraments. We contend not for, but profess the *Roman Number Seven*, and give our Consent they be



two: at the same time observing, that tho' we account  
 Sacraments to be outward Signs of inward Grace, yet we must  
 not on all outward Signs of inward Grace to be Sacraments.  
 I freely affirm this, which I suppose will be deny'd by none,  
 that Acts of Obedience which a Child or a Servant pays to the  
 Father or Master, are outward Signs of that inward  
 Grace whence those Acts of Obedience should flow; that is to  
 say, Love to, or Fear of the Father or Master, or else (which  
 is either Love to, or Fear of God, who commands that Obe-  
 dience) in like manner every Act of Obedience which a man yields  
 to the Commands of God, are outward Signs of that in-  
 ward Principle of Action, which hath its Seat in the Heart  
 whence that Obedience (if right and ac-  
 cording to God) doth certainly arise; to wit an holy Love to, and  
 Fear of God: So Prayer, reading the Holy Scriptures &c.  
 are outward Signs of inward Grace, and as truly such as Baptism  
 may be not Sacraments.

That holy Principle, which may be justly call'd the Spring of  
 Obedience, may possibly have a Place in the Hearts of men  
 who are capable of exercising their Reason, and of rea-  
 soning themselves into a Compliance with the will of God; on  
 which depends this inward Principle, which is a spiri-  
 tual Principle of Faith, Fear and Love. neither of which can pose-  
 ssess a being in an Heart void of Understanding. Wherefore  
 little Infants are without Understanding or the Power of  
 their Reason, it is most evident they are without that in-  
 ward spiritual Grace, whereof *Water Baptism* is an outward Sign.  
 Harmless and happy Infants, are without Faith, Fear and  
 Principle or Spring of spiritual Motion, without which all  
 outward Obedience signifies nothing, nor indeed doth a just and  
 God seek for any such Principle in them.

What signifies Prayer, Reading, and hearing the Word of God?  
 without Faith in God, without Love to him, and a holy filial  
 Affection: All these things and whatever else possibly nameable  
 outwardly, cannot and will never recommend any man to the divine  
 Father whom there is not that inward Grace, whereof these  
 outward Signs, See *Gal. 5. 6. In Christ Jesus neither Cir-*  
*cumcision any thing nor uncircumcision, but Faith which worketh*  
*Righteousness.* *Rom. 14. 6. Without Faith it is impossible to please God.*  
*He that is not of Faith is Sin.* From all which we justly infer,  
 that *Water Baptism* be a Sacrament, it cannot be so to an In-  
 fant, only be so to such who are capable of having that  
 inward Grace of it is an outward Sign, yea and more than what is  
 outward Sign, because in a Sacrament the outward and  
 inward is joyn'd to the inward invisible Grace by a Sacramen-  
 tal Union, as the *Assemblies* Confession rightly observes, and which  
 is the wisest and justest Distinction which should be  
 made between the outward Sign in a Sacrament, and other out-  
 ward Signs of Grace which are not Sacraments; which  
 should be consider'd



consider'd fairly brings us to this Conclusion, that a Sacrament cannot be administred to an Infant, or to any irrational Creature. Regard no Part of it can be to them an outward Sign of Grace, for it cannot be a Sign of what neither is, nor possibly will be. Whence it is evident that *Water Baptism* cannot be administred to an Infant as a Sacrament, because in such Administration doth not answer to the Nature of a Sacrament, wanting the essential Part, to which the outward Sign has a spiritual Relation to which it is join'd in a Sacramental Union: and being a Sign of itself, it is at most but a Sign without the Thing signified, and we are sure the thing signifi'd cannot be, it is a Sign of nothing, and so in reality it is no Sign at all, and manifestly contrary to the Intention and Use of a Sign, which is, to signify something, and always supposes the being of that which it signifies. In consequence of all which, I say, that since *Water Baptism* is a Sacrament, it cannot be administred to an Infant as such, it ought not to be administred to it at all.

To pass on, let it be observ'd that as we agree upon the Definition of a Sacrament, to be an outward Sign of an inward Grace, we also agree in another Definition of it, viz. that it is an outward Sign, such as the ancient Romans took to be true to their Generation. This makes way to argue further against Infants supposed Right to Baptism from the Nature of a Sacrament, according to this Definition or description of it.

### Argument the Second.

If *Water Baptism* be a Sacrament, it cannot be administred to an Infant; but *Water Baptism* is a Sacrament, —therefore it cannot be administred to an Infant.

The Consequence of the Major in this Argument will be evident, and will be secur'd as followeth.

If a Sacrament be an Oath, by which the Person who takes it doth solemnly swear Allegiance to the Lord Jesus Christ, the Consequence of the Major is true;

But a Sacrament is an Oath &c. therefore the Consequence of the Major is true.

In Defence of the Consequence of this last Argument.

If it be not in the Power of little Infants to swear Allegiance to the Lord Jesus Christ, then the Consequence of the Major is false.

But it is not in the Power of little Infants to swear Allegiance to the Lord Jesus Christ—therefore as was to be proved, and by which it is evident, that *Water Baptism* as it is a Sacrament or Oath, cannot be administred to little Infants, by whom no Oath can be taken, and of whom no such Oath is requir'd, nor can Justice be, since they have not the Power of making an Oath, which, calls for the greatest solidity of Thought, and the deliberate Exercise of the Understanding; because it is a solemn Engagement upon the Soul, the non observation of which, may be to the Ruine of the Person who takes it. Which consider'd, we suppose, that a little Infant is capable of taking a Sacrament.

Power of such Consideration: Surely this is highly unreasonable, since a Sacrament is an Oath, the administering unto whom it cannot be such, is to destroy the very nature of the giving it to one, unto whom it cannot possibly be an Oath; is to make it an Oath, and not an Oath at the same time, which is a manifest Inconsistency. Wherefore this Argument must stand good against Infant's Right to Baptism, so long as it is admitted that a Sacrament is rightly defined to be an Oath, and that the just and natural Import of the Word; against which the Pedobaptists can have no just Exception, because it

is the Opinion of *Chester* who was a Gentleman of none of the smallest Learning among the Presbyterians, in his *Communicants Companion*, thus defines a Sacrament, p. 2d. and 3d. viz. "A Sacrament is an Oath, as the ancient Romans took, to be true to their Generals: (*virtually or in Religion*) it is an Oath of Allegiance to the Lord Jesus Christ, by which we ingage our selves to be his dutiful and loyal Subjects.

For the Account of the signification of the Word Sacrament, *Barclay* gives us in his Apology. And tho' he was neither a Presbyterian nor Pedobaptist, yet being a Gentleman of Learning, his Opinion may be depended upon for the Sense of a Word, as well as the Judgment of another; for by how much the more indifferent, as to the siding with either Party, by so much, the more regard should be paid to his Explication. But I suppose the Pedobaptists will dispute this Definition of a Sacrament, and therefore we hope they will deliberate upon this Point, and seriously consider what Answer they would give to Christ in the Day of Judgment should this Question be then put to them, viz. how could Baptism be administered to little Infants as a Sacrament when they themselves had defin'd it to be an Oath, which it is obvious that the Power of taking?

It is equally incumbent on all Mankind (I mean those who are capable of taking a Sacrament in this remarkable sense; to take it as an Oath of Allegiance to the Lord Jesus: For what can any man expect for from Christ, who refuses to swear Loyalty to him? We suppose that a man's refusing it, is less than to refuse to acknowledge him as his Lord, who should reign over him. *Mt. Henry's* Doctrine in his *Communicants Companion*, p. 68. is to be accounted very good, in which he says that we must enter into a Covenant with the Lord our God, and to his Oath; for that else he will not own us for his People. From all which it appears to me very evident, that no Sacrament, but he who takes the OATH, for which it is no Sacrament.

And the Supper of the Lord signifies nothing to any, but to those who solemnly give themselves up to Christ, and heartily engage themselves to him. Those Persons who are to be Baptized, are to give themselves up to God, and then to his Church according to his Will, 2 Cor. 8. 5. Until they do this they do nothing:

Until

Until this be done, there is nothing done which will be a Sacrament to an Infant, who wants the Power of giving up to Christ, or of taking an Oath of Allegiance to him; and one is a Stranger to the Mystery that lies in Baptism, not the Power to converse by Faith; with the thing it which yet is so necessary that no man can promise himself from a Sacrament, further than he converses by Faith with it is therein signify'd. Which leads me to argue further an Infant's Right to Baptism from the nature of a Sacrament.

### Argument the Third.

It is most ridiculous to administer a Sacrament to a little Infant. But Water Baptism is a Sacrament.

Therefore it is most ridiculous to administer Water Baptism to an Infant.

For support of the Major Proposition of this Argument I argue.

It is most ridiculous to administer a Sacrament to one who lies under a natural and unavoidable necessity of receiving it.

But to administer a Sacrament to a little Infant, is to administer it to one who lies under a natural and unavoidable necessity of receiving it in vain.

Therefore it is most ridiculous to administer a Sacrament to a little Infant.

As no part of this Argument can be deny'd but the Minor make it good by the following Argument.

To administer a Sacrament to one who has it not in his Power to converse by Faith with the thing signify'd, is to administer it to one who lies under a natural and unavoidable necessity of receiving it in vain.

But to administer a Sacrament to a little Infant, is to administer it to one who has it not in his Power to converse by Faith with the thing signify'd.

Therefore to administer a Sacrament to a little Infant, is to administer it to one who lies under a natural and unavoidable necessity of receiving it in vain, as was to be proved, And which proves, that it is most ridiculous to administer a Sacrament to a little Infant.

I am persuaded that all the knowing Gentlemen of this Controversy, will readily give it as their Opinion, that it is most ridiculous to administer a Sacrament to an Idiot, at what time he is not capable to converse by Faith with the thing signify'd in a Sacrament; which is certainly a good Reason, and the utmost Justice carry'd to the Regard an Infant's want of Power to converse by Faith with Christ in a Sacrament, is equally the same with

## Christian Baptism.

7

where the want of Power is equal, the Argument taken  
such want of Power, is equally forcible against both.

*Henry* in his *Communicants Companion*, p. 2. hath these or like  
which are both remarkable and pertinent to the Point in  
viz. " whoever shall content themselves with the Sign only,  
but conversing by Faith with the thing signified, do receive  
Grace of God in vain: And *Sacraments* ( mark, *Sacraments*  
Plural number ) will be to them, what Parables were to  
who were willfully blind, they will blind them the more ;  
much as they have the Shadow without the Substance,  
well without the Kernel.

Doctrine of Mr. *Henry* I am firmly persuaded, is agreeable  
acles of God ; for that all the Prophets and Apostles do  
y teach the same things, instructing mankind in this Be-  
as Faith without Works is dead, so also are Works with-  
n, a stinking Carcass in the Account of our Redeemer.  
Faith it is impossible to please God in any Act of Religion.  
*Abel's* Faith which made the Firstlings of his Flock a more  
e Sacrifice, than the Fruits of *Cain's* Ground. The Har-  
was justifi'd by works in receiving the Spies, but yet it  
Faith that saved her. *Abraham* was justifi'd by works,  
offer'd up his Son *Isaac* ; but yet it was his Faith which  
works acceptable, and which was imputed to him for  
ness. It was *Noah's* Faith which made the Ark the In-  
of his and his Children's Salvation from that Flood, which  
nd destroy'd an unbelieving World. So it is Faith in  
st make *Sacraments* acceptable Sacrifices, and give them  
vor in his Nostrils.

was the Doctrine of the Apostles, so it was also of their  
*Basil* the great taught the same Lesson, when saying,  
nd Baptism are two means of Salvation, nearly allied and  
ble : For Faith is perfected by Baptism, and Baptism is  
upon Faith.

indeed in such sort allied to Baptism, as to be insepe-  
d to it, and that on which it is founded ? How then can  
supposed to have a Right to Christian Baptism, more  
; since the latter has as much the Power of conversing  
with the thing signifi'd in a Sacrament, as the former :  
truth is they have no right at all.

's Opinion and Advice in Reference to this Point is wor-  
hest Estimation and universal acceptance, as mentioned  
*Taylor* late Bishop of *Down* and *Connor* in his *Liberty* of  
223. viz. That the Baptism of Infants should be defer'd  
ould give an Account of their Faith. I could heartily  
vice might be candidly received by all the Pedobap-  
stendom. I will use my best endeavours to enforce it,  
e Success to him, unto whom of Right it ought to be



## *Infants not the Subjects of* *Argument the Fourth.*

There are no Persons should be accounted the Subjects of Baptism, but such who are able to answer that, which the most justly requir'd of them.

But there is that most justly requir'd of Persons to be baptized, which little Infants are not able to answer.

Therefore little Infants are not the Subjects of Water Baptism. To maintain the Minor Proposition of this Argument, I Argue.

Faith and Repentance are justly requir'd of Persons to be baptized. But little Infants are not able to answer that, which in these Particulars are justly requir'd of Persons to be baptized.

Therefore there is that most justly requir'd of Persons to be baptized, which little Infants are not able to answer, in consequence of which we rightly say, that little Infants are not the Subjects of Christian Baptism.

The establish'd Church of *Ireland* doth certainly express the sense upon this Question, *viz.* What is requir'd of Persons to be baptized. To which Answer is given, agreeable to the Account of the New Testament, Repentance whereby they forsake Sin, and Faith whereby they stedfastly believe the Promises of God, in that Sacrament.

*John* the Baptist did (as do all the Baptists to this Day) require Repentance of those who came to his Baptism; strictly charging them, to bring forth Fruits meet for Repentance, worthy of the Kingdom of Life, and denied Baptism to those, in whom he saw not those Fruits, *Mat.* 3. 6. to 12, *Luke* 3. 12 to 15. In like manner the Apostle *Peter* called for Repentance as a Qualification for Baptism, *Acts* 2. 37. and baptized such only, who gladly received the Word. The Apostle *Paul* in all Places preach'd Repentance to God, and Faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ. *Acts* 20. 21.

Whoever reads with Observation the History of the Apostles will see, that these faithful Stewards of the divine Mysteries were wont to baptize none, but such who made Profession of Faith. *Philip's* Answer to the Eunuchs Question, *What hinders me from being baptized?* was, if thou believest, thou mayest; which plainly sheweth that if he did not believe, his unbelief would hinder him from being baptized. On the Eunuchs professing Faith in Christ as the Son of God, he baptized him: And when the *Samaritans* professed Faith in the Doctrine concerning Christ and his Kingdom, he baptized them. Men and Women, *Acts* 8. 12. 36 37. When the *Jaylor* professed Faith in the Lord Jesus, and his Household making like Profession, he and they were baptized. *Acts* 16. 32 33. When the chief Ruler of the Synagogue in the City of *Corinth*, and the Inhabitants of that City, believed the Doctrine preached by *Paul*, and made Profession of their Faith, they were baptized. Men and Women, *Acts* 18. 8.



## Christian Baptism.

9

se Texts of Scripture fully prove the Doctrine of the Church  
land and Ireland in their Catechize above mentioned to be  
that Repentance and Faith are justly required of Persons to  
ized, and in Regard little Infants are capable of neither, we  
rightly infer, that Water Baptism ought not to be adminis-  
them, but that rather it should be deferr'd until they are able  
in Account of their Faith: And in so doing Christian Church-  
ld follow the Example of the Church in *Justin Martyr's*  
may be collected from his *Apology to Antoninus Pius*, viz. that  
ho believed the Doctrine which they taught, was true; af-  
ng and Prayer, they brought them to the Water and washed  
erein, in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost.  
*Beveridge* in his Exposition of the 39 Articles, on Article the  
these words, " Our Saviour immediately before his Ascen-  
commanded Baptism to be administred in the Name of the  
r, Son and Holy Ghost, *Matth.* 28. 19. His Church hath  
ore in all Ages requir'd a Profession of Faith in these three  
s, of all that were to be Baptized; and therefore to prepare  
catecumens for Baptism, she hath still instructed them in  
they ought to believe concerning each Person, which when  
ad learned, acknowledged and professed ( either by them-  
or by their Sureties ) they were presently received by Bap-  
to the Church of Christ.

Account of the Bishop there lies this Truth as plainly as  
pressed in Words, that it was the Custom of the Christian  
all Ages, to require a Profession of Faith, in Father, So  
Ghost, of all whom she consented to baptize; and that  
d not administer Baptism to any, until that Profession  
either by themselves or their Sureties. Now if it be  
what is affirm'd by some, that Sureties were not devis'd, un-  
th Century, then it will follow from the Bishops Words,  
the Custom of the Christian Church, for four Hundred  
east, to prepare her Catecumens for Baptism, by instruct-  
in what they ought to believe concerning the Trinity;  
they were instructed and their Judgment convinc'd, and  
for themselves make a Profession of their Faith, they  
that Profession, and not without it, admitted to Baptism.  
nce and Faith are Doctrines, in which the Children of  
Parents should be well instructed before they be admitted  
; that they may have a good Understanding and know  
sm means, or the Mystery that is contain'd in it, and be  
verse by Faith with God and Christ therein, and with  
lfe is signified thereby: Thus it was with the Christian  
the first Ages of the Gospel, as we have seen above,  
will yet further appear in due time from the fourteenth  
But to Proceed.

## Infants not the Subjects of Argument the Fifth.

If no Person has a Right to Baptism until he first enter Covenant with God, then Infants are not the Subjects of it.

But no Person has a Right to Baptism, until &c.—Therefore

To maintain the Consequence of the Major of this Argument further argue.

If it be not in the Power of little Infants to enter into a Covenant with God, then the Consequence of the Major is true.

But it is not in the Power of little Infants to enter into a Covenant with God.—Therefore &c.

Every man whose stock of Knowledge is not the greatest, that a Covenant mutually agreed upon between two Parties is a solemn thing, as the Apostle teacheth, Gal. 3. 5. if (saith he) but a man's Covenant; yet if it be confirmed, no man dissolveth it, or addeth thereto.

When men do mutually agree upon a Covenant, they draw it in writing, after which both Parties can deliberate upon it, prove or disapprove and make such alterations and amendments as they shall think expedient; but when it is once confirmed by solemn Acts of Signing, Sealing and Delivering, it must not be annulled, but by the Consent of both Parties. If either of them repents what is done, that Repentance comes too late.

The Law of God as well as the Law of man doth require that Covenants be faithfully kept, which shews us that they are to be, even as they generally are, the Result of solid Consideration for great is the Concern which men have about their Affairs of this World, and it would be well for them if they were as solicitous and as heartily concern'd about the much more important Affairs of the Soul, and the World to come: That above all they would be most tender of a Covenant made with the Lord, which should be accounted in a special Sense sacred, the violation of which may be the everlasting Destruction of the Soul.

Now will any man after due exercise of Thought suppose that a little Infant is capable of making any such Covenant, or that it is possible for any man to make any such Covenant with it? Surely this is most apparently unpossessable, and I grant, that a Covenant must be made with Christ in person, must be received as a Sacrament or Oath of Allegiance to God, in which the Baptized doth solemnly swear to be Subject to him; and must not we all say, woe be to him who takes this Oath! also woe be to him who refuses to take it, to make that Covenant! See Mr. Henry's *Communications* p. 68. "In vain do we expect the Blessings of a Covenant, if we are not willing to come under the Bonds of it. We must enter into a Covenant with the Lord our God, and into his Oath, that he will not own us for his People. And p. 51. "Am I not God? If not, I have no Part or Lot in this matter. "To seal a Covenant with God? But if I never made the

## Christian Baptism.

11

in sincerity consented to it; I shall put a Seal to a Blank, or a Curse. And p. 73. " We then enter into a Covenant with God when we accept his Salvation with an intire Complacency and Confidence in the methods which infinite Wisdom hath provided for reconciling a guilty and obnoxious world to himself, by the Mediation of his Son. And p. 68. " A Covenant is mutual, like that, which is between a Man and his Wife.

All this let us observe first (that according to Mr. *Henry*) that the Covenant is mutual. Secondly that as such, it must have the Consent of both Parties. Thirdly that it is not a Covenant, in the sense of a Covenant, without such Consent. Fourthly, that there be such Consent, the setting a Seal to any suppos'd Covenant, is the setting a Seal to a Blank.

That imaginary Covenant made for (not by) Infants, at Baptism, it is most manifestly a Cypher, a mere nothing, inasmuch as it hath not the Consent of the Party, and concludes nothing but not binding the Party to any thing, to which it would have been bound by the Law of God without it. See Mr. *Henry*. " What was done for you at Baptism, was done without your Consent, and at most made you but incomplete Christians, not you must be Christians with your own Consent, or else not Christians at all.

Soberly consider'd brings us to this Conclusion, that Infants are not the Subjects of Christian Baptism, wanting the Power of that Covenant with Christ, which should necessarily be at Baptism, and without which Covenant, as we have observ'd in *Beveridge* (on the last Argument) the primitive Church for many hundred Years, would not consent to administer Baptism to Infants. But I proceed.

## Argument the Sixth.

Any Ceremony in the Christian Religion can have any saving efficacy to any, but such who therein answer a good Conscience to God. Infants are not the Subjects of Baptism.

Any Ceremony in the Christian Religion, can have any saving efficacy to any, but such &c.—Therefore &c.

The Force of this Argument is secured by 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. And is undeniable but the Consequence of the Major, in support of the further Argue.

It is impossible for little Infants to answer a good Conscience to God in any Ceremony of the Christian Religion, then the Conclusion of the Major is true.

It is impossible for a little Infant to answer a good Conscience to God.—Therefore &c.

Christ's Words mention'd before in his *Communicant's Companion* may again be referr'd to viz. " What was done for you at Baptism made you but incomplete Christians, at most Christians without your own Consent, but you must be Christians with your own Consent or else not Christians at all.

Exactly

Exactly agreeable is Mr. Henry's Doctrine last mentioned Words, with the Doctrine preach'd by the Apostle Peter in above referr'd to, viz. the like Figure whereunto even Baptism now save us, nor the putting away the Filth of the Flesh. Answer of a good Conscience to God, or as an old Translation it, in that there is the Consent of a good Conscience to God.

I must for the present account that man a Babe in understanding and needs that one should teach him again, which be Principles of the Oracles of God, who will suppose, that in Religion will be of any saving advantage, to which the Consent of the Conscience, yea and that of a good Conscience too: For thus teacheth all the Prophets, that the Heavenly God looks for Truth in the inward Parts, he looks to for the Heart, without which he will not be satisfi'd: not as man look at the outward Appearance, nor is he for outward Performances in which the Conscience is not concerned: it is with the Mind we worship God, or we worship him for as he is a Spirit, he will have spiritual Worship. We are content, that it is the Consent of the Mind or Conscience which makes all Acts in Religion sweet and acceptable to our Lord Jesus Christ; and without which Consent of Conscience he makes no Account of any thing we do. Read the following of Scripture, and thence learn to get and keep a good Conscience that in Simplicity and godly Sincerity, not with fleshly but by the Grace of God, you may do every thing you or in Obedience to him. *Acts* 24. 16. *2 Tim.* 1. 3. and *1. 19 Heb.* 10. 22.

That Man who knows what Conscience is, knows what will be true; and he who knows not what Conscience is, knows not yet as he ought to know, but takes all his Steps in the dark: he knows not whether he is going.

That thing call'd the Conscience, must it self either be understanding, or else is dependant upon it; which admitting Infants nor Idiots can be supposed to have any Conscience good or bad to God-ward; in regard they both are want of Exercise of Reason, and so in the want of Understanding then can it be conceiv'd that Infants more than Idiots have Right to Baptism? when it is not possible for them to give Consent of their Conscience to Christ therein; and if the Benefit of Baptism consists in the Consent of the Conscience, it is evident that an Infant can have no Benefit from Baptism, whether Ceremonie in the Christian Religion; but the former shews the first to be true, and thence we must conclude the latter is true also.

Dr. Jeremy Taylor Bishop of Down and Connor in his *serm.* p. 321. 322. owns that this Question was put to him at Neocaesarea viz. Whether it was lawful to Baptize with Child? and whether the baptizing a Woman with Child was not the baptizing the Child in her Womb? To which



in the sixth Cannon, that it was lawful to baptize a Child, and that the baptizing of her, was not the Child in her Womb; because in Baptism a Confession is made, which Confession saith the Bishop, plainly supposing Understanding and free Choice, and intimates that the baptizing of Infants was not the Custom of those Times. All which concludes in Defence of my Position, that Infants are not Subjects of Christian Baptism.

## Argument the Seventh.

Ceremonie in the Christian Religion will avail any thing to the Soul, but what springs from Faith in and Love to Christ; baptizing of Infants is insignificant.

There is no Ceremonie in the Christian Religion will avail any Soul, but what springs from Faith in and Love to Christ. Therefore the Baptizing of Infants is insignificant.

The Tenour of the Holy Scriptures doth effectually settle the Minor Proposition of this Argument, particularly *Heb. 11. 23.* and *Gal. 3. 6.* which consider'd, I have only to deduce the Consequence of the Major, to which end I further argue. It is impossible for little Infants to exercise an holy Faith in God, or an holy Love to God in any Ceremonie in the Christian Religion, when the Consequence of the Major is true.

It is impossible for little Infants to exercise an holy Faith in God, or an holy Love to him, in any Ceremonie of the Christian Religion. Therefore &c.

It will teach, that any Act in the Christian Religion, or Ceremonie, will avail any thing to the Salvation of the Soul, which is grounded in Faith and Love, I shall not be over hasty to receive. I shall chuse rather to wish him a better understanding. That Love is the fulfilling of the whole Law, as summing up all the Precepts of the first and second Table; the great Commandment being, to love the Lord our God with all our Mind and Strength, and the Second to love our Neighbour as ourselves; on which two hang all the Law and the Prophets. Faith and Hope without Love (were it possible to separate them) would signifie nothing; how much more must we have outward and bodily Righteousness, to be but as filthy rags without Love.

The Truth is, that our most inward and spiritual Righteousness comes from God, but it is acceptable to him and results to his Favour through our Lord Jesus Christ; and Righteousness consists chiefly in Faith and Love. Who cannot obey this great Command of the Law, to love God, it is impossible he should pay an acceptable obedience to any part of the Law or Gospel: And sure I am that a little Child is not the Power of loving God whom he hath not seen; nor is it possible he wants the Power of loving his Neighbour, whom

whom he hath seen, as being altogether unacquainted with for want of the Exercise of Reason, which doth or should govern the Affections, and let the inward man upon Act frequently a little Infant is not able to give any Obedience neither indeed doth he call for any from it; for he is than to require Obedience where it cannot possibly be the Case of Infants and Idiots, whose Salvation depends any Condition, which they want the Power to comply with.

The boundless Grace of God, through the Death and Resurrection of his Son, hath made rich Provision for the Salvation of innocent Infants, who never made any personal Transgression of the Law; so that notwithstanding Salvation is tender'd to go upon Terms, not impossible to be comply'd with, but such as are reasonable; yet is no Condition mentioned in Holy Scripture which God purposes to save an Infant; which shews us that he solves on the Salvation of dying Infants, as an Act of his own, through the Merits of the Lord Jesus Christ only, without any on their Part done or to be done. Wherefore since in every religious Action the infinitely merciful and wise God, calls for Love and a little Infant cannot answer that Call, we conclude that Infants are not concern'd in any religious Condition at all, consequently not in Baptism.

Let the unhappy Divisions and Subdivisions among Christians ever so many, yet surely we should all agree with the Apostles in this Doctrine, that the Heart must be given in every Act of Religion; for that the giving the Body without the Heart, nay the giving all we can possibly give without the Heart, signify nothing. Wherefore in regard a little Infant cannot give the Body nor the Heart, nor can any Action done for him give any thing but the Body; All that hath been said before, must terminate in this Conclusion, that Infants are not objects of Christian Baptism.

Thus have I argued against Infant's Right to Baptism. Arguments, all taken from their want of Power to perform the things justly requir'd of Persons to be baptized; and I might add Arguments of that kind much beyond seven times seven, but that these are sufficient: Since it is granted by all, that Infants by reason of their tender Age are unable to perform the things there are Sureties provided for them, who become their Sureties, engaging for them that when they come to Age and be able to engage over themselves, that then they shall make good the engagements made for them and in their name, when they were baptized.

The Kirk of Scotland is so easie in this matter (as I ought I know) makes so light of it, that they are contented only shall stand Sureties for their Children, and so discharge them from any further Engagements.

The Kirks of Rome and England &c. probably not thinking of sufficient Security for the Performance of so great a Charge, order, that other Persons beside the Parents, shall be

th them : And these are called by a Name to which *Moses*  
 Prophets and all the Apostles were intire Strangers, viz. God-  
 and Godmothers. Some there are who call them Od-Fa-  
 and Od-Mothers, it may be fearing that joining the Letter G,  
 g them under the breach of the third Commandment. But  
 matter as it is, I think they are odd sort of things, of which I  
 read any thing in Holy Scripture. Some there be who call  
 a Name much more agreeable to their Nature, and that is  
 thers, and Pope-Mothers, not that they would suppose them  
 thers and Mothers of the Pope, because they know, that  
 ve neither Fathers nor Mothers ; but they so call them as  
 they are such, as the Pope has constituted Fathers and Mo-  
 those who were never begotten by them, either naturally or  
 y ; and so its conceiv'd this new name will more plainly  
 r Original, than doth the name by which they are called.  
 e made a Question, whether there were any such thinge  
 world as Godfathers and Godmothers, until the time that  
 came into the World ? it's very probable the Answer in  
 ould be, that there were not : Agreeable to Mr. *Delaune* in  
 r the Non-conformist p. 41. where he observes from the  
 History, that Godfathers and Godmothers were the Inven-  
 e fifth Century ; for that nothing is read thereof in the  
 As for my part I see not the least room to doubt, but this  
 was design'd to supercede the primitive Custom of baptiz-  
 ecumens, which was when they were well instructed in,  
 a Profession of the Christian Faith, which Custom was  
 the primitive Churches for four hundred Years, as own'd  
 the learned and most note<sup>d</sup> *Pedobaptists*. Mr. *Delaune* in  
 the non-conformists furnishes us with the names of se-  
 em, as *Ludovicus, Vives, Hugo Grotius, Daille* a learned French-  
 Feild, *Walafridus, Strabo, Moribus* and others ; who shew  
 m was deferr'd in ancient times, until a Profession of  
 made by the Catecumens, when advanc'd to a considera-  
 and they add that this is evident from the History of *Con-*  
*dosius, Valentinian, and Gratian*, and that it also appears  
 those, the Orations of *Gregory Nazianzen*, and the writings  
*Tertullian, Justin Martyr* and others.  
 necessary the *Pedobaptists* should observe, that in the fifth  
 en the Apostacy had made it self very strong, and had  
 Root in the World, and was thereby become too strong  
 Church of Christ, supported by great Numbers and  
 ers ; they call'd Councils and establish'd their Inven-  
 ovations by Ecclesiastical Cannons ; then it was, that  
 things they found out and set up Infant's Baptism.  
 they knew that the preceeding Ages did not baptize,  
 Profession of Faith, and that Infants were not able to  
 profession ; they therefore devis'd this pritty Invention  
 or Godfathers and Godmothers.

If Credit may be given to Men of none of the smallest fifth and following Centuries, produc'd excellent Head-  
full of rare Inventions in Religion, of which this of Fide-jussors is the least remarkable. I own I am not a little surpriz'd to see that Men of Sense who pretend understanding in the Holy Scriptures should give the least Countenance to it; specially when we consider'd, what a vast Stock of Ignorance accompanies it, and in it almost necessarily leads the common and unthinking many of whom are observ'd to say (and among these some and Figure) that a Name is given to a Child, as if it was a Dog, it gets a *Christning* with it; and they are also ready to say that a Name is nor rightly given unless the God-Father give freely pass the severest Reflections upon, and ridicule the *Arians* and *Quakers* for giving their Children Names like Dogs. I doubt these poor ignorant Souls would be very angry with us if we tell them, that just in such manner those got their Names who were first called God-Fathers and God-Mothers, that is, so called like Dogs without a *Christning*. We may satisfy our selves that the first of that kind had no God-Fathers or Mothers to give them their Name, and it is also at least probable that they were called so without a *Christning*. Certainly the Name is not a Christian Name, and if not a Christian Name must be Antichristian and belongs to a Family to whose Members Protestants should not have the strongest Affections.

But we conceive this is a matter in which we are very concerned, and that we may content our selves to lie open to reasonable Reflections, which flow from the lamentable state of the Times we live in; whilst well assur'd from the Word of Heaven, that a Father has a right to give his Child what he pleases, without any such Ceremony in Religion, and we are if any Man thinks otherwise, he is a Stranger to those holy Scriptures.

As for Fide jussors (*i. e.*) Sureties, or Bonds-men, or *God-fathers* and *God-mothers*, it is enough for us to know that they were born out of due time above four hundred years before Christ, that they are not to be met with in the holy Scriptures, therefore against the 39 *Articles* of the Church of England, especially against the sixth Article; and since these *Articles* are establish'd by Law, it should seem to me as if so far these *Articles* are contrary to the Law of *England*, as every thing else (which according to that Article) is not warranted by Scripture.

What have we to do with the Inventions of the fifth Century, when the Beast began to rise, and the World began to wax old; when *Daniel's Little Horn* began to wax great, to cast down the Stars, and cast the Truth of God to the Ground; when Sin lifting himself up in Pursuit of that Power, by which he had been a Plague to the Church of God, as well as to the World, had been a Plague to all *Christendom*, See *Dan.* 8. 10 to 14. first 12 Verses. *ev.* 13 and 14 Chapters.



I am a great Favourer of the Account which the late Bp. and Connor Dr. *Jeremy Taylor* gives us of these useless, out way things called God-fathers and God-mothers, in his *Li-Prophecy* p. 222. 223. and tho' the Bishop speaks in the Per- mother, it's easie to collect that he speaks his own Sense, his Words are,

Now God might if he would have appointed God-fathers God-mothers to give Answer in Behalf of Children, and be jussors for them; but we cannot find any Authority or ed that he hath; and if he had, then it is to be supposed ould have given them a Commission to have transacted emnity with better Circumstances, and to have given An- with more Truth: For the Question is ask'd of believing present, and if God fathers answer in the Name of the [I do believe] it is notorious they speak false and ridicu- For the Infant is not capable of believing, and if he were, e also capable of dissenting, and how then do they know d: And therefore *Tertullian* gives this Advice, that the of Infants should be deferr'd, 'till they could give an of their Faith, and the same also is the Account of *Gre- anzen*, altho' he allows them to hasten it in case of Ne- for tho' his Reason taught him what was fit, yet he erborn by the Opinion and Practice of his Age, which gan to bear too violently upon him; and yet in another makes mention of some, to whom Baptism was not ad- by reason of Infancy, to which we add, that the Parents *Justin*, *St. Hierom* and *St. Ambrose*, altho' they were Chris- did not baptize their Children before they were Thirty Age.

Derive from this learned Bishop, 'that we cannot conclude uthority of the Word of God, that he ever appointed e and God-mothers; which is certainly true, for there is the Holy Scriptures to support them, nor is there the of Reason to countenance the Continuation of them, e contrary, that Reason enlightned by Scripture is alto- st them, as may in some measure appear from the fol- uments.

### Argument the First.

Can justly be accounted Christians, until they are such in Consent, then all that can be promised by Sureties their Baptism is insignificant. The former is true — Therefore the latter.

### Argument the Second.

Can a Seal to a Covenant not consented to, be the put- a Blank, nay to a Curse, then all Promises made by Infants are insignificant: But the first is true, — There-

*Argument the Third.*

If no Covenant made, signifies any thing to any but he consents to it, then all Promises which are made by Sureties for Infants at their Baptism, signifie nothing ;

But the former is true, — Therefore the latter;

*Argument the Fourth.*

If Sureties for the Performance of a Baptismal Covenant not invented until the fifth Century, then the setting up of God-fathers and God-mothers is unwarrantable ;

But the first is true, — Therefore the latter.

*Argument the Fifth.*

If no Person can put himself in the Place of, and become a God-father for an Infant at his Baptism, without speaking falsely and arrogantly, then the Being of God-fathers and God-mothers is unwarrantable ; But the former is true, — Therefore the latter.

*Argument the Sixth.*

If nothing should be received in Religion as an Article of Faith, or as any way necessary to Salvation which is not read in Scripture, nor can be proved by it ; then the countenancing of God-fathers and God-mothers, as Sureties for little Infants is unwarrantable ; But the first is true, — Therefore the last.

These few Arguments are grounded upon Mr. Henry in his *Communicants Companion* ; upon Dr. Jeremiab Taylor, Bishop of Exeter, in his *Concorde*, the *Mazdeborgh History*, and the Sixth of the 39 Articles of the Church of England, in such particulars as wherein I am assured that the sound Doctrine is contain'd, and here I could multiply Arguments against the warrantableness of Sureties for the Performance of a Covenant, made for Infants at their Baptism ; a Covenant to which they had not the Power to keep, and to which they had not their Consent ; and such a Covenant, as the Sureties themselves could not keep, no not the very best of them, and those who are the best of them ( as Men of Conscience ) will sadly acknowledge want of Power to keep it, and heartily lament their Breach of it.

However, since these Sureties are so warmly contented with them, Men of great Learning and by so considerable a Part of the Christian World, may it not be necessary for us to inquire into the following Particulars.

First, Who these Sureties are bound to ? Whether they are bound only to Man ? or whether they are bound to God ?

Secondly, What are they bound to do, or bound to suffer by those Infants, whose Sureties they are, when they come to the

they really and indeed bind themselves, that they shall the Devil and all his Works, with the Pumps and Vanities of this wicked world, together with all the sinful Lusts of the Flesh, they shall keep God's Holy Commandments, and walk therein unto the end of their Lives?

Are those Securities which are taken for the Performance of the Baptismal Covenant solvent or insolvent? I mean are they the Lord Jesus Christ Satisfaction for the non performance of this Covenant by those Infants when they come to Age? If Papists become Sureties for the Infants of Protestants, or Protestants for the Infants of Papists, that they shall be brought into the Faith into which they are said to be baptized, whether they do not covenant and bind themselves contrary to their Consciences? And whether those Ministers, be they Papists or Protestants who accept those Sureties, be not unfaithful to their Consciences if they have any Conscience at all; for this is frequently done?

What sort of Sureties are those, whether Papists or Protestants, who are very wicked both as to Swearing, Cursing, Drunkennes, breaking the Sabbath &c, at the time when their Security is taken for the Performance of this Baptismal Covenant? Must we believe, that the accepting such Security, is an abominable Sin upon the Son of God, in that he must be put off with such a manner of Security must be made? — Most astonishing! that those who call themselves the Lord's Ministers, should accept of, and hold such promises from those who are Enemies to Christ by their wicked works, for the Performance of a Covenant so solemn in which such Men as whose words they themselves would not be bound for fifty Shillings. Must the great Lord of Lords be put off, notwithstanding they are so apparently Bond-slaves to the Devil? Surely the time will come, when God will visit his Adversaries, and avenge him of his Enemies.

What is the Penalty of those Bonds? What must be done to those Securities, in case these Infants for whom they are taken do not perform when they come to Age? We know that if Bonds pass'd to one another bear some Penalty: For if they are not bound, we must but pay.

The Bonds perfected by these Bondsmen, are of a very small value if they have no Penalty at all; for as such they are but a mere matter of Form, a Trifle and manifest Banter and Mockery. But surely the *Pedobaptists* will not say, that the Bonds as these, which they pass to the Lord Jesus, when they take them of Sureties or Bondsmen for little Infants, that they shall perform the Three-fold Vows made for them at

are not such Bonds as these, but Bonds which bear some great weight, not a matter of the greatest Moment and Consequence. Now what the Penalty is? for how do they know, but it

it is a Bond and Judgment, a Bond with a Warrant of Arrest to take out Execution against Body and Soul? How do the Lawgivers but the Judgment enter'd up in the Court of Heaven doth require that in case the Infant when he comes to Age, doth not perform the Covenant made for him in Baptism, that then the Surety be damn'd for such non-performance.

Were the *Pedobaptists* sure of this, that the Judgment upon the Bond did run thus, it might probably startle them. Thoughts as might make the Gossipping Cup too bitter. Sugar in Christendom to sweeten it; and for ought our Fathers know their Bonds may run thus in Heaven in what Form soever they may stand here upon Earth. Oh that Men would and that they would wisely consider, that he who hates a Suretiship is sure! Specially such a kind of Suretiship as is in danger the loss of Heaven.

I own I am often astonish'd to think of the Folly and Madness of Men and Women, in suffering themselves to be decoy'd into a Custom into an Action which may make way for sad, and too late Repentance: A matter which may be of the greatest consequence in the World, and of the last Consequence to them, and yet they make no more than a Play of it, whilst taking their Round of the Gossipping Cup, and making themselves as drunk as Bees upon the Head of a new made Christian: A compleat Christian made so without its own Consent! a Christian which knoweth nothing of Christianity.

The Apostle *Paul* in reasoning upon Righteousness, and Judgment to come, made *Felix* tremble, and almost made King *Agrippa* to be a Christian; but after all he was but a Christian: As for these little innocent harmless Babes, far from being almost Christians, that they know nothing of the matter, and are utter Strangers to all the Follies, they are too justly chargeable with.

But to return, to inquire what the Penalty of those who are perfected by those Fide-jussors or Sureties for little Infants, the Infants for whom they are bound, when they come to Age, prove wicked as they generally do; for they never become worse after Baptism, since better they cannot possibly be, to the innocency and harmlessness of their Nature; and yet they should continue wicked to the end of their Lives, as many of them do, thousands of them so wicked as to bring them to the Gallows by their Wickedness, what must be demanded of the Bondsmen for this breach of Covenant? Surely it is incredible that the Lord Jesus Christ should have some Satisfaction for their non-performance.

If any Man be bound to another, if he be held in by an earthly King, and the Condition be not perform'd, the King in general, the Solicitor General and all our Judges will require Satisfaction, that Satisfaction must be made to the King's Majesty, Sureties, they must answer for the non-performance of



reties they were ; and shall no Satisfaction be given to the Kings, by Fide-jussors for the non-performance of a baptism made for little Infants at their Baptism ? Are all Sureties Particular insolvent ? not one of them able to give Satisfaction ? Oh hard case ! the Son of God is finely hop'd up with all not every Man of Understanding say, it were as well there should be no Securities at all, as to have such who are not able to make any Satisfaction for non-performance.

In the *Roman Catholicks*, there is something to be said for them ; Mother *Rome* has made kind Provision for them, so that by the *Roman Antichristian Law*, they may be brought off severally, by Works of Supererogation, by their holy Penances, at dear place call'd *Purgatory* ; a place whose Scituation is thousands of Miles beyond the North Pole, nay many thousand Miles beyond the whole Creation of God : A place at so great distance from us, that a Voyage to the World in the Moon would not reach it.

But to return, to shew how the *Roman Catholicks* can discharge all their Debts : Since it is possible for them to be more righteous than we, for their own Salvation, its only transferring or consigning the surplus of their Righteousness to the Account of their God-Children, in full Satisfaction for all their Bonds to the Lord Jesus.

Do you think Courteous Reader ? Suppose a good honest *Catholic* should say fifty Thousand *Pater Nosters*, and one hundred and fifty Thousand *Ave Marias*, every Day of his Life, and repeat four times every Year, one hundred and fifty Thousand times bare-foot and bare-leg'd and upon his bare *Lough-dereg* ; think ye not that he must be a graceless, and much more ignorant than the *Pope* himself, who says, that this is sufficient ? Yea and so much more than the Opinion of all Protestants especially ) that the Virgins of Heaven would deserve to be expell'd her Censures for ever, if she did not compel her Son to accept Satisfaction for themselves, and in full Discharge of all Debts for those Infants for whom they became Sureties ; but especially if to this they shall add, a Continuance in *Purgatory* for a hundred Thousand Millions of Years ; then surely all Protestants must be a plenary Satisfaction to the Lord Jesus, for their Baptismal Engagements, altho' they had stood Godfathers and Godmothers for one half of the whole World.

Unhappy *Ped baptists* of the Protestant Fraternity, of all sects ! what in the World will become of you ? how is it possible for the Art of Man to secure you ? you that cannot be more than what you ought to be ; you that after having done all you can, as unprofitable Servants, in whose best Performances there is no Merit enough for your own Salvation, but must needs dependance on the Merit of another ! you that being engaged by the Law, shall at last but scarcely be saved, and that by Grace only ;

only ; you that never cut your Knees on the Rocks of *Long* can hope for ease in an easless *Purgatory* ; are you bound to satisfaction do you propose to give the King of Kings, for the safety of those Infants, for whose Performance you have bound your selves.

When *Judah* became Surety to his Father *Jacob* for the return of *Benjamin* from *Egypt*, we read what the Penalty of the Bond was if I bring him not back, let me bear the Blame for ever, and *Ruben* also joining himself with *Judah* in the same Bond, the Penalty thereof was the Death of his two Sons, *Gen.* 42. If I bring him not back, slay my two Sons.

Oh thou *Pedobaptist* ! who art snared by the words of the Covenant in becoming Surety for the Performance of a Covenant, the Name of an Infant at his Baptism, in case he performs not, must be done to thee ? must thou bear the blame FOR the non-performance ? must thy Sons be slain for such non-performance ? or must thou DAMN'D thy self for them ? go to now I pray thee, take my Advice, humble thy self before God unto whom thou hast bound thy self ; ask his Pardon in the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ, for what thou hast done already ; and solemnly resolve thou wilt not do it a Fide jussor more ; thus deliver thy self as a Bird from the Hand of the Fowler, and as a Roe from the Hand of the Hunter, *Exod.* 17. From what has been said, I hope it will appear to every Man truly thoughtful, that the giving and taking God-fathers and God-mothers as Sureties for the Performance of a Covenant for Infants in Baptism, is unwarrantable. And now after we have set our selves to inquire, where lies the Benefit of all this to the Infants, and from their being baptized upon such Securities, after a fair Examination it will be manifest that they have no Benefit from it at all, and that Baptism is intirely usefess to them : For the Salvation of the Soul is happily secur'd without it, and no spiritual Benefit or ecclesiastical Privilege arising from it, is manifest they have none, more than they would have had without it, both which I shall endeavour to make good by the following Arguments, which I conceive have no small weight against the Practice of Baptism, as taken from the useflessness thereof to the Infants.

### Argument the Eighth.

If it be unreasonable to administer Water Baptism to a Person until such Person can have some spiritual or saving Benefit from such Administration, then it is unreasonable to administer Water Baptism to a little Infant :

But it is unreasonable to administer Water Baptism to a Person until such Person can have some spiritual or saving Benefit from such Administration ; — Therefore &c.

In Defence of the Consequence of the Major, I form the following Argument, If little Infants neither do nor can receive any spiritual

the Administration of Water Baptism to them, then the  
 force of the Major is true :

little Infants neither do nor can receive any spiritual or fav-  
 our from the administration of Baptism to them ; ———

Ec.

For good the Minor Proposition of this Argument, I further

Water Baptism administer'd to little Infants doth not put them  
 in a better Condition than they were in without it, then little  
 Infants have no Benefit from the administration of it to them ;

Water Baptism administer'd to little Infants doth not put  
 them in a better Condition than they were in without it ; ———  
 Ec.

OR be reasonably suppos'd, that any part of this Argument  
 may be deny'd, but the Minor ; and I cannot see, that with any  
 reason or Justice it can be deny'd by Protestants ; because  
 of it ( so far as it relates to the Salvation of the Infant )  
 consistent with their Confessions and Protestations against  
 the Doctrines of *Rome*, which teach that Baptism is so  
 necessary, that little Infants dying without it, cannot be  
 admitted into the Kingdom of Heaven, they seem unwilling to say, that Infants dying without  
 it will be damn'd, or that they shall go to *Purgatory*, for tho'  
 she is resolv'd they shall neither go to Heaven, nor to  
 Hell ; yet she is so compassionate to those innocent Babes,  
 who have no Fault, that she has provided a Limbo, or  
 happy place for them ( and no doubt has furnish'd it with abun-  
 dantly of all things which she calls *Limbo Infantum*, Where  
 they shall be happy ; I confess I know not ; tho' I know right well  
 that it is not in any part of the Creation of  
 this World ; for I know it is not in any part of the Creation of  
 this World ; where else it can be, the Lord of *Oxford* knows not ; it's  
 possible it may be within a million of Miles of that place call'd  
 Limbo, which for ought I know may be within a Door or  
 two of us.

For all this Roman Catholick Stuff, I say that that  
 which will not admit little Infants into Heaven, because  
 Baptism is a Doctrine which proceeds from the very  
 Roman Ignorance ; a Doctrine most justly to be con-  
 sider'd as an Antichristian Heresy. Astonishing Ignorance ! to  
 think that an Infant should be deny'd eternal Happiness, because  
 it had neither the Power to perform, nor to  
 receive it. A Supposition of this kind strips the Divine Being  
 of Mercy and Justice at once.

If Infant's Baptism was expressly commanded by God (certainly is not) the not administering it to an Infant could be no Crime in the Parents, or such other whose Business it was, but no Crime in the Infant, for its want of Power to obey the Command would plead its Excuse both to human and Divine. And if any Man thinks otherwise, I must believe that he has an indifferent Notion of Justice: And that he would (had he been a cruel Task Master, in requiring an impossible Obedience) that his Head is too full of wild Conceptions of a God infinitely just and good, in supposing he has made a Law, to which he requires Obedience, from such Persons who cannot possibly understand. Where a Man can and will not understand; his Ignorance is no Cloak for him: For wilful Ignorance is most justly punished. Crimes of the first Rank, tho' we admit, that invincible Ignorance (as is that of Infants and Idiots) discharges from all Obligation to Obedience. As Mr. John Abernathy doth well observe in his excellent Discourse intituled *Religious Obedience founded on perfect Obedience*, and particularly in his 22d. page. Now if this be true of such Persons, how much more should it be admitted so in Infants. Very cruel then must be the Opinion of those who condemn millions of the most innocent part of the human Race as damned, or that a harmless Infant can have no Entrance into the Kingdom of Heaven, unless it's involuntary Reception of the Sacrament of Baptism shall procure it's Admittance. Amazing Conception of rational Creatures! what shall it be thought that a few Drops of Water from the Hands of a Priest shall have so much Power, as to force open the Gates of Glory, and quench the Flames of divine Wrath!

The Church of *Scotland* in her National Covenant, and Confession of Faith which was subscrib'd by the King, Nobles, and Gentlemen, Burgeffes Ministers and Commons, do profess this severe Doctrine in these words *viz.* "We do abhor the *Roman* Antichrists cruel Judgment against Infants, who are without the Sacrament; as also his absolute Necessity of Baptism. Again in their Directory to the administration of the Sacrament they order the Minister to tell the People "that outward Baptism is not so necessary, as that through the want of it, the Soul is in Danger, or the Parents guilty, if they do not comply with the Ordinance of Christ. They add, that it is not necessary to be delay'd, so it is not to be administered by any private Person, but by a Minister of Christ." See the 28th Article of the *Westminster Confession*. Hence the Church of *Scotland's* Opinion is, that Baptism is not to be delay'd, and that the Delay of it will not endanger the Soul. So contains an Answer to that common Question, What is the terrible Ignorance is the Mother of, *viz.* What will be the Fate of Infants, who die without Baptism? The Kirk's Answer is safe: And the Reason is obvious, because it was never intended that they were not baptized, tho' it were supposed to be commanded.



are some Infants, whose Mother's Wombs by the Dispo-  
 divine Providence are made their Graves: There be other  
 who tho' they are born alive, yet go out of the World the  
 instant they come in: Now if the Question be put, what will  
 of these Infants? whosoever shall give Answer to this Ques-  
 agreeable to what we have from the Church of Scotland as  
 and shall say with the *Roman* Doctors in a repugnancy to the  
 scriptures, that Water Baptism takes away original Sin, and  
 those who die unbaptiz'd are under the guilt of it and can-  
 not be sav'd, or that after Death they can have no better place for  
 eternal Residence than *Limbo Infantum*: I must take leave  
 of such a Man, that his understanding is marvelously be-  
 hind that his Dwelling is in the dark Shades of Antichristian  
 Ignorance, and that tho' he should be ever so great a Man or Scho-  
 lar, who understands the Hornbook of Christianity, is able  
 to mislead him.

But here if need requir'd run into many Arguments to prove  
 that Infants are saved by Grace, through the Merits of our  
 Saviour without Water Baptism, and that it will not contribute  
 to their Salvation; but there appears not to me any occa-  
 sion; having enough to support the present Argument without  
 it, I suffice me to refer such who have a desire to think upon  
 this, to a Sermon preach'd by Mr. *Samuel Aiton* of *Nampt-*  
*ton* excellent Discourse intituled *Dying Infants saved by Grace*: I  
 will refer them to Mr. *Thomas Grantham's* Infants Advocate.  
 The principal Design in what I have immediately offer'd is to  
 shew that little Infants have no saving Benefit from the administrati-  
 on of Baptism to them; but that they are (in reference to the Salva-  
 tion of the Soul) in as good a Condition without it, as they possibly  
 can be by it: And I am willing to hope what I have spoken  
 of will be deem'd sufficient for that Purpose. And  
 I pass any further, I shall beg my Readers Excuse for  
 dwelling a little on the above mentioned Passage in the Church of  
 Scotland, viz. Outward Baptism is not so necessary, as that  
 the want of it the Infant is in Danger or the Parents guilt-  
 y, do not contemn or neglect the Ordinance of Christ.

It affords ministers an occasion to me to assure all Mankind,  
 who are called *Anabaptists* have the Evidence of our own  
 Conscience (and hope that our Protestation will obtain Credit with  
 you, to whose Consciences we desire to approve our selves)  
 in delaying Baptism to our Children, until they covenant  
 for themselves, doth not in the least arise from any  
 neglect of the Ordinance of Christ, which we have and  
 hold in the highest Estimation; and I am perswaded it  
 will be supposed of us, that as Parents we are without  
 objection to our Children, or are destitute of that Paternal  
 affection, which ordinarily fills the Breasts of the most  
 tender Hearted Parents. We heartily wish for their ear-  
 ly Conversion, that they may Religiously remember their Crea-  
 tor

Creator in the Days of their Youth, and covenant with Christ in their Infancy; and as their Reason ripens, so as that they are capable of Instruction, we admonish them to forward the work of Conversion speedily, and cleave to God with full purpose of Soul, and specially careful, that they contemn not the Ordinances of the Gospel, in contenting themselves to remain Strangers and Foreigners to the Kingdom of Heaven; that they should rather strive to get within the Walls of the Church, and become Fellow-Citizens of the Saints and of the Household of God; that their Baptism be not deferr'd one day beyond the time which they may conveniently have it, as a thing of their own choice, and to which a warm Affection to Christ and a desire of everlasting Salvation shall move them, that their religious Obedience may be founded in and flow from their Personal Profession, and so be acceptable to God through our Lord Jesus Christ.

I deny not, that some of our Children when they come to us do act contrary to that Advice we give them as Parents; and contrary to those Instructions our Pulpits frequently afford them; who put off the great Work of Conversion, and sadly neglect the weighty Concernment of the Soul, and all the Ordinances of the Gospel; and thereby make the Hearts of their Parents sorrowful; yet this must be accounted their own Guilt, and not the Guilt of their Parents: And after all in this Particular we are but upon an unhappy Level with the rest of our fellow Christians, even of the *Pedobaptists* whose Children's Disobedience is an Occasion of grief to them, as ours do to us. So that seeing Baptism too early administer'd has been in vain, and upon second and more solid thoughts they may probably be inclin'd to wish it had been deferr'd until Conversion had proceeded it, and so brought it in its proper time and place, surely where Persons baptized do not walk answerable to the Obligations their Baptism lays them under (according to the apostles way of Reasoning *Rom. 2. 25.*) their Baptism is accounted as no Baptism.

*Solomon* teaches, that every thing is beautiful in its Season; and the Apostles Doctrine is, that all things in Religion should be done decently and in Order, which plainly intimates that there is a certain Order to be observ'd in that Obedience which is due to God: That it must be a regular Obedience so that every thing in Submission should keep its proper Time and Place according to divine Appointment: That a Man should not begin at the End of his Duty, to put that first which should be last, and last which should be first, so making Obedience a confusion; but we must have Respect to all the righteous Commands of God in a proper and regular order of Succession, observing the first Command first, which is first to be obey'd, and so on to the rest of God's Commandments.

It is observable (as before hinted) that by the Law none shall be admitted to the Holy Communion of the Lord's Supper, until they are Confirmed, or are desirous of Confirmation.

laying on of the Bishop's Hands; whence it is evident that  
 of the Church of *England* is, that the Obedience which  
 to divine Precepts must be regular and appear in what they  
 be good Order, every Act in Religion keeping its proper  
 and Place; for it would certainly be much out of Order  
 to receive the Lord's Supper first, and be confirm'd af-  
 to be confirm'd first and be baptized after, because that  
 to invert the appointed Order of our Obedience, which  
 plainly revealed in the Doctrine and Practice of the holy  
 who constantly teach, that that Command which first takes  
 on us, and we must have the first Place in our Obedi-  
 that Command which calls for and wills our Conversion:  
 evident that unconverted Souls have no right to tread  
 courts or meddle with sacred things, and if they presume  
 what ever they do even their very Prayers will be an  
 tion to God. The very first thing that a Man must do,  
 him and make him clean, and put away from before  
 of a holy and pure God, the evil of his doings, as *Isaiab*  
 in his first Chapter.

Parents the Baptist and our blessed Redeemer, as also the Apostles,  
 upon their Ministry, the first thing they called for as  
 Obedience, was Repentance from dead works, or a  
 Sin; for they knew that Wisdom is founded in the fear  
 the holy Spirit constantly teaching that the fear of God  
 the beginning of Wisdom, or the very first Step which Wisdom  
 leads to everlasting Glory. Now after Repentance is laid,  
 the Succession of Obedience comes the Profession of Faith  
 in Christ, next in the Beauty of Holiness comes Water  
 and then follows Confirmation or laying on of Hands:  
 what we may call the introducing Ceremonies of Chris-  
 which usher Men into the visible Church and external Commu-  
 nity of Saints, incorporating them into Christ's Body; where  
 together and ty'd with Bonds of Christian Love, must  
 their Advances in Religion, passing from a State of In-  
 to a State of Spiritual Manhood or Maturity; growing  
 bounding in Knowledge and in every good Word and  
 that both towards God and Man; labouring to appre-  
 for which they are apprehended of Christ; pressing to-  
 the highest State of Perfection Man's Nature is capable of,  
 must be done in a regular Observation of all things which  
 are commanded, and performing every particular Duty in  
 its time and Place, excited thereto from an Expectation of  
 the Resurrection of the Dead and eternal Judgment.

must affirm is that beautiful Order, in which the King  
 calls for our Obedience, *Heb. 6. 1. 2.* and we must be-  
 lieve that it is our Duty to contend earnestly for it; as being  
 that where this Order is inverted, as by putting Baptism  
 before Conversion, or by being baptized first and repenting and be-  
 lieving afterwards whereas God calls for Repentance and Faith first  
 and

and Baptism after, or where any other Duty in Religion out of the proper Place which it ought to have in a regulation of Duties, it is a putting Contempt ( I will not say directly ) upon the Ordinance of Christ ; and I hope I can truly therefore do we contend for this Order, because we would that any of Christ's Ordinances should be contemned, we know ought not to be ; believing with the Church of Scotland it is a very great evil and may be attended with dangerous consequences, in regard the Lord Jesus Christ is a great King, who justly commands all Mankind to be subject to his Laws, without addition to them or diminution from them. The Truth of this may be seen in the following Texts of Scripture, *Matth. 23. Mark 1. 4. and v. 15. Luke 3. 1 to 14. verses. Mark 16. 15. Luke 28. 19. 20. Luke 24. 47. Acts 2. 37 to 42. Heb. 6. 1. 2. Romans to the end. Prov. 30. 5. 6. Deut 4. 2.*

Now to proceed. As the Business of the foregoing was to shew, that Infants have no saving Benefit from the Administration of Baptism, it being evident that the Salvation of Souls is secured without it ; the Design of the following is to shew, that neither have they any Spiritual Benefit from the Administration, in that it doth not give them a right to that Privilege in the visible Christian Church, which was the thing I propos'd to prove ; therefore in Defence of this I further Argue.

### Argument the Ninth.

Water Baptism is an initiating Ordinance into the visible Christian Church : But it neither doth nor can initiate little Infants into it.

Therefore Infants are not the Subjects of Water Baptism.

The Major Proposition is allowed true by all Parties, therefore I have only to defend the Minor, which will be done by the following Argument.

That Ceremony in Religion which doth initiate Persons into the visible Christian Church is such, as gives them a Right to the Communion of that Church :

But Water Baptism doth not give little Infants a Right to the Communion of the visible Christian Church.

Therefore Water Baptism neither doth nor can initiate little Infants into the visible Christian Church, as was to be proved, if it be an initiating Ordinance to all unto whom it is minister'd, then it will follow by the clearest Demonstration that Infants are not the Subjects of it.

It is plain from *Acts 2. 41. 42.* and indeed from the History of the new Testament, that those who were admitted to the visible Christian Church by Baptism, had a Right to the Communion of that Church, and accordingly they were joined together in Fellowship one with another, in the Apostle's Doctrine, and in the Eating of Bread and in Prayer.



Church of *England's* Definition of the visible Christian Church is only right, viz. That it is a Congregation of faithful Men and Women, among whom the Doctrines of the Gospel are faithfully taught, and the Ordinances thereof duly and rightly administered: See the 19th of the 39 Articles.

A Congregation as thus defin'd is made up of such Members capable of having Communion and Fellowship one with another, both in Gospel Doctrines, Gospel Ordinances and Prayers, and in the whole of that Spiritual Worship which God requires of his People; and it is most demonstrably true that little Infants can be no part of a Church so defin'd, probably the Church of *Scotland* was aware of, and therefore gave a different Definition of the universal visible Church, viz. The visible Christian Church consists of all those throughout the World, who profess the true Religion TOGETHER WITH THEIR CHILDREN. See the *Assemblies Confession*,

Reason the Kirk of *Scotland* had, for varying thus from the Church of *England* I ken not, for I own I see no Reason for the use of these Words TOGETHER WITH THEIR CHILDREN. For it is my Opinion the Article would have done much more had been much more agreeable to Truth without them: It would then have not only been more agreeable to the Church of *England*, but also to the Scriptural Notion of a visible Gospel Church. However after all it will do the *Scotch Pedobaptists* no Service at the Point of *Pedobaptism*: Since it is evident that those who are said to be initiated into the visible Church of *Scotland* by *Pedobaptism*, are no more initiated into the Communion of the Church, than those Infants who are said to be initiated into the Church of *England*, who it may be are more forward than those of the Church of *Scotland*, to admit unqualifi'd Members into the Communion; of which and the evil of which I wish she was sensible. Yet I do not hereby excuse the Church of *Scotland* for she were not guilty of an Error (and which is a great Error) in being over forward to receive Members into her Communion before true Conversion gives them a Right to that Privilege. It is well known to all that Infants as Infants, yea and for a considerable time after they pass the State of Infancy, until they are able to make Promises for themselves, and a personal Profession of Faith, are not admitted to the Communion of either of the Churches of *England* or *Scotland*.

The Church of *England* they must be able to answer the Questions of the certain Catechise, in relation to the Apostle's Creed, the Ten Commandments, and some other Articles of Faith, to qualify themselves for Confirmation, without which Confirmation they are not admitted to the holy Communion, the Law of *England* extending it (how little soever in Practice that Law is really observed) to these Words "And none shall be admitted to the holy Communion until such time as he is Confirm'd or ready and desirous

desirous to be Confirmed. All which consider'd, it is evident little Infants by Baptism are not initiated into the visible or permitted to have any Spiritual Privilege in it, as nor any right to the Communion of it: Consequently they Benefit from Baptism at all, for tho' it be in its own Nature an initiating Ordinance, and is so design'd by the Lord Jesus neither is nor can be so to little Infants since it gives them to no Privilege, to which they would not have a Right without it.

If it be said, they have a Right to go to Church with their Parents, it may be answer'd, they would have the same without it.

If it be said they have a Right as they grow up to hear the Word preached, and have also a Right to the Sacrament of the Church; to this it may be answer'd, they would have the same to those Things, if they were not baptized.

If it be said that when they come to Years of Discretion to the Exercise of their Reason and do profess Faith in Christ, they promise to renounce the Devil and all his Works, and to live a Godly Life, that then they have a Right to the Sacrament of the Church, and the holy Communion of the Church.

To this I answer (with desire my Reader will deliberate on) that he will think twice before he passes Judgment, and be especially careful that no prejudices possess his Judgment. Since I say my Answer is that since the deferring of Baptism is unnecessary, and that it doth not indanger the Damnation of Infants for that their Salvation is made safe another way; that they have no Right to the Communion of the Church till they come to Age and make Promises for themselves, and become Christians with their own Consent; This is the only fit time for them Christian Baptism, and to initiate them into the Church, and to a Right to all the Privileges thereof at once. Fully considering that they thereby keep their Children Christian 'till they are well instructed in the Articles of the Christian Religion, and act in an agreeableness to the Practice of the primitive Church, who thus did for the Space of Four Hundred Years, as is observed: *Ludovicus Vives* thus express's himself, "None were old baptized but those who were of Age, who did understand what the Mystery of the Water meant, but the same. To which add the Words of *Dr. Field* " That those that were born of Christian Parents, besides those who were converted from Paganism put off their Baptism for a time, inasmuch that many were made Bishops before they were baptized.

I own I am not a little surpriz'd, that Gentlemen of the best Sense and of sober Conversations will continue a Practice so warmly for it; which they themselves so plainly and fully confess to be useless: A Practice without which the Infant may be saved; and a Practice by which it may be either one way or other.

viewed by learned Pedobaptists that antiently when Men added (contrary to the Practice of the Apostolical Church) the Sacrament of Baptism to Infants, they thought they were bound to give them the Sacrament of the Supper accordingly they gave it them, and that for some hundred Years in the *Latin and Greek Churches*; upon which a certain Man put it as his Opinion, that the one might be given as well as the other, for that in reality they had no Right to either; and by his Persuasion, that the practice of baptizing Infants came upon a Mistake of our Lord's Words to *Nicodemus, John 3. who is not born of Water and the Spirit, cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven*. And that the practice of communicating Infants, or giving them the Supper, came in upon a like Mistake of his Words in *John, Whosoever eats not my Flesh and drinks not my Blood, they cannot come in to me*. See Dr. Barlow Bishop of Lincoln's Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury. All which duly consider'd, will bring us to the Truth of the Question, (*i. e.*) that Infants are not the Subjects of Baptism.

Now proceed to argue against Infant's Right to Baptism: the warrantableness thereof by the Holy Scriptures and the understanding Man will grant that if the Holy Scriptures do not warrant it, it must then be accounted an unwarrantable.

### Argument the Tenth.

Should be received as an Article of the Christian Faith, as necessary to Man's Salvation, but what is read in the Scriptures or may be proved from thence, then the Doctrine of Baptism is not to be received as an Article of the Christian Faith, or as any way necessary to Man's Salvation.

Should be received as an Article of the Christian Faith. Therefore &c.

Proposition is the 6th of the 39 Articles of the Church of England, the Consequence of the Major may thus be proved, if the Doctrine of Infant's Baptism be not read in the Holy Scriptures, it cannot be proved thereby, then the Consequence of the Major

Doctrine of Infant's Baptism is neither read in holy Scriptures, nor can it be proved thereby: Therefore &c.

Of the Minor of this Argument, I further argue.

If the Doctrine of Infant's Baptism be either read in holy Scriptures, or can be proved thereby, then some one or other of the Gentlemen on either Side the Question, can point out that part of the Holy Scriptures in which it is read, or by which it can be proved.

But not any one of those Gentlemen who stand on the other Side the Question, can point out any part of Holy Scripture in which it is read, or by which it can be proved.

in which the Doctrine of Infants Baptism is read, or by which it can be proved, — Therefore &c.

I know it has been alleg'd by the Gentlemen I oppose, tho' the Doctrine and Practice of baptizing Infants cannot be proved by any expresse Scripture, yet it may be proved by Consequences which they say are justly deduced from the Scriptures; and they have taken abundance of Pains to find out those Consequences, and have consumed abundance of time which they might have spent in a much better Improvement of, for I think I can without any great Difficulty say, that tho' I am very far from being one of the strongest Anabaptists, yet weak as I am, I can undertake to shew the Weakness of all the Arguments which as yet hath appeared to me, in Confidence of which, I shall further argue.

### Argument the Eleventh.

If the Practice of baptizing Infants cannot be proved either by some Precept in Scripture expressly commanding it, or by some President in Scripture expressly shewing it to be the Practice of holy Men mention'd therein, nor by any Consequences fairly deducible from the Holy Scriptures; then the Practice of baptizing Infants is unwarrantable:

But the Practice of baptizing Infants cannot be proved either by any Precept in the Holy Scripture expressly commanding it, or by any President expressly shewing it to be the Practice of holy Men mentioned therein, nor by any Consequences fairly deducible from any thing therein premised.

Therefore the Practice of baptizing Infants is unwarrantable, as I was to be proved; and every Man is bound to admit it (as I conceive) unless he knows of some Passage in Holy Scripture which warrants the Practice either by Precept, President, or Consequence honestly arising from what is premised in such Passage; but for the present I must believe that no such Passage is to be found in all the divine Writings: For I have been suppos'd, that were it possible to find any such Passage, some one or other of those Gentlemen who have hitherto wrote largely in Favour of Infants Baptism, would certainly have brought us to it; but this they have not done, and it will appear singular in my Opinion as to this particular, when so we shall see as Dr. Barlow Bishop of Lincoln, has profess'd himself of the same Opinion as in these Words "I have read what my good Friends

"Baxter, Dr. Hamond and others have wrote upon this

"I must own that I am not a little surpriz'd, that Men

"Parts should say so much to so little Purpose for I

"any thing like an Argument for Infant's Baptism

I am perswaded that all who are impartial will agree that Dr. Barlow was a good Judge of an Argument, and that he has shew'd his Mind candidly; for where a Man shall speak against a Practice, and be admitted to be a probable Sign of his Sincerity,



Dr. Hamond, and those others the Bishop speaks of, did they could in Favour of the Cause they espoused, and did as much as could be done by any other, but it is impossible for the clearest Heads and brightest Parts to support a Practice, which the Holy Scriptures refuse to maintain. It is generally granted, that the Scriptures do no where require it, that the History of the Acts of the Apostles, gives no express proof of its being practis'd by them, so that now nothing is precluded by the Consequences, about which it is an easy thing for Men of the most considerable Parts to be mistaken.

Chief Justice Cook in matters of Law, specially in such cases, wherein Man's Life is concern'd; is very much against them, what his Lordship calls argumentative Verdicts; in reason are attended with such notorious uncertainties, and there is no Possibility for Men to be mistaken in their Conceptions, even when they are diligently seeking out the Truth, in the language of unintelligible Circumstances, attending certain cases, whereupon they have brought in innocent Persons to death, for Crimes they were no way concern'd in, whereof I give some Instances.

From divine History, that good old Jacob (notwithstanding he was a Prophet) was mistaken in the Conclusion he came to, to the Death of his Son Joseph, whose Coat was brought to him, or torn, and bloody; he knew the Coat was Joseph's, and seeing it to be torn and bloody he draws this Conclusion from the Consequence from the Premises, *Joseph is no doubt torn*

As I conceive, be for the advantage of the Pedobaptists, how much more easy it is for them to be mistaken, in granting Right to Baptism, as a Consequence from some Premise they find premis'd in holy Scripture; for Instance they at least they suppose they find that Infants were in Covenant, whence they infer they have a Right to Baptism; whereas a little Consideration might discover, how unnatural the Inference is, as they argue upon it. Those that have an Interest in the Covenant, have a Right to the S E A L S of the Covenant: Infants have an Interest in the Covenant;—Therefore they have a Right to the S E A L S of it. Now let a due attention be paid to this Argument, and the corruption of the reasoning will be manifest, when apply'd to their own Practice; for observe they grant a Right to the S E A L S of the Covenant, in the same manner, yet in Practice they give them but one, viz. Baptism, and keep them back from the Supper, which they own to be the second Seal. Now if it should be made a Question, which of the two is the most Injustice, the Baptist or Pedobaptist; or whether keeping from them both Seals, or the Pedobaptists in giving them one? supposing they have a Right, they are equally wrong to both Parties, and the wrong they receive from the Baptists is equal to what they receive from the Pedobaptist. But

upon the supposition they have no right, the Baptists doth wrong at all: And however this matter is, the Baptists Consistency with themselves, for in keeping away both (they may be safely call'd Seals, which is deny'd) it is become believe with Dr. Barlow Bishop of *Lincoln*, that they have to neither. But the Pedobaptists act inconsistently with the for they believe they have a Right to both, to the S E the Covenant in the Plural Number, and yet they give one. The very truth is that they have a Right to neither let it be noted that neither is Baptism or the Lord's Supper call'd the Seals of the Covenant in holy Scripture; therefore any other Considerations might lead us to see, that this Reasoning is very corrupt, and terminates in the most and unreasonable Conclusions.

Again they observe, that Infants were circumciz'd under the Law, and thence they infer by Consequence, that they ought to be baptiz'd under the Gospel, for after this manner do they reason.

If Infants had a Right to Circumcision under the Law, a Right to Baptism under the Gospel, — But the first is Therefore the last. I own it is very strange to me, that learned Men, and of such great account, as are among the Baptists, should reckon this good Reasoning, specially if they supposed they must needs know, how many several Arguments may be turned upon them, as thus, First if Infants had a Right to the *Passover* under the Law, they have a Right to the Lord's Supper under the Gospel; — But the first is Therefore the last: The Reasoning is their own, but will not account the Conclusion to be just and honest. If none but the Males had a Right to Circumcision under the Law, then none but the Males have a Right to Baptism under the Gospel, — But the first is true — Therefore the last, — The Reasoning is still the same, but all must grant it to be an unnatural and false Conclusion, and fairly shews us, that *Abraham's Seed* had any thing to do with Circumcision alone from the Covenant that God made with him and his posterity, from the express word of God: And therefore to argue that Infants have a Right to Baptism, simply from the Interest they have in the Covenant, is in my Opinion most ridiculous; since evidently they had an Interest in the Covenant, altho they had no Seal with the Seal.

Again the Pedobaptists observe, that our Lord took Infants in his Arms and blessed them, saying, *of such is the Kingdom of Heaven*. Hence they also infer Infants Right to Baptism by a Consequence as clear as the Sun, thus they reason, If Infants have a Right to the Kingdom of Heaven which is true, — Therefore they have a Right to Baptism which is the lesser Conclusion is deduc'd from the Premises, I'll give the Argument a Turn upon my good Friends that

If Infants have a Right to the Kingdom of Heaven which  
 eater, then they have a Right to the Lord's Supper, which  
 offer:—But the first is true—Therefore the last; the  
 their own, and the Minor is their own, and the Consequence  
 but as naturally as in theirs, but to say the Truth of it, it  
 natural in both.

the Pedobaptists do take notice, that in a certain Passage  
 sure, Children (in an undetermined Sense) are said to be  
 ed from thence also they infer, Infants Right to Baptism,  
 soning from the Words. If the Infants of believing Parents  
 they have a Right to Baptism;—But the first is true:—  
 be the last. Marvelously strange, that these should be the  
 of Men of Sense! for the Absurdity of such Reasoning,  
 ars by retorting the Argument—If the Infants of believing  
 be holy, they have a Right to the Lord's Supper; —  
 first is true—Therefore the last.

ersuaded that if they will allow themselves the Liberty  
 ate and think calmly of this Matter, they will plainly see  
 they to use a Thousand such Arguments as these, the  
 nce of the Major can never be defended. I shall only  
 their pretended Consequences one Step further, and take  
 them for the present.

ake Notice that the divine Historian informs us, that whole  
 were baptized by the Apostles, and thence they con-  
 Infant's Right to Baptism may be deduced by an unde-  
 sequence and that because Infants are parts of House-  
 m really astonish'd at the Dimightedness of Men, and  
 uch that ingenious Men should imagin, that what is taken  
 instance is a just and natural Inference.

is manner do they argue from this Relation, *whole House-*  
*baptized*; and Infants are Parts of Households, — There-  
 what? — I am sure it will not be just to say There-  
 ought to be baptiz'd: For no such Conclusion lies in,  
 ibly come from the Premises, more than I should inter-  
 ight to the Supper from their Right to the *Passover* by a  
 y of Reasoning, thus; whole Households eat the *Passover*  
 ts are parts of Households — Therefore — what? — Let  
 ptists make the Conclusion what they will, so they make  
 one: As for our Parts we have no need to say more;  
 he Weakness of this Reasoning, then that there were,  
 all Cities a vast number of Households in which there  
 e, should it then be thought strange that three great  
 World should afford three Households in which there  
 ts, One in the City of *Corinth*, said to be the chief City  
 ne in *Philippi* the chief City of *Macedonia*, and one in  
 niple City of *Asia*: Where then lies and whence then  
 Consequence; most certain it is, that what they call  
 are none at all.

I heartily

I heartily wish that Christian Prudence would direct the baptists to consider whether they have just Reason to believe they are better Judges of Consequences, than were the Fathers of the primitive Churches for the first four Centuries, who could see Infants Right to Baptism, as a Consequence couch'd in the thing premis'd in holy Scripture, and therefore they kept the Children Catecumens, until well instructed in the Faith, and then rightly qualify'd to receive that Sacrament, besides also it is observable to remark, that when Infant's Baptism was first brought in, and in the fifth Age of Christianity had got a Party strong to support it, and too strong for the true Church to withstand, doth not appear that it was brought in upon the foot of Consequences but rather from a Mistake in a prevailing Opinion in those times that Baptism took away original Sin, on which they imagin'd the Salvation of Infants dying in Infancy was precarious, and to be doubted, unless they were baptiz'd before their Death. I think may be most clearly collected from the Words of the Decisions of those Councils which decreed its Practice, the first of which as Dr. *Jeremy Taylor* Bishop of *Down* and *Connor* seems to affirm, which also appears from the *Magdeburgh History*, was the Council held in the 4th Century, the Words of whose Canon are these: "That it is our Will that all that affirm, that young Children receive everlasting Life, albeit they be not by the Sacrament of Grace or Baptism renewed; and that will not touch the Children, which are new born from their Mothers Wombs, shall be baptiz'd to the taking away of Original Sin,

That they be Anathematiz'd.

Since this Canon curses those who affirm'd that young Children should receive everlasting Life without Baptism, it is evident there were such who taught that Infants might be saved without it. Secondly since the Canon condemns those who refused Baptism to Infants, it's thence evident there were those who refused Baptism to Infants, and who taught that Baptism took away Original Sin as they did, and the apostate Council ever since corruptly imagin'd, and on which Foot it was that Infant's Baptism was first brought in, and is ever since continued to take away the Danger which attends the delay of Baptism, then what is there left to support the too early admission of it: If Infants may be safe tho' dying without it, there is no occasion to wrest and strain any Texts of Scripture to deduce a natural Consequence to maintain an unnecessary Practice. Observe from this Canon, how early the Pedobaptism first appearance of Pedobaptism, learned the way of laying down poor Anabaptists with their frightful *Anathemas*, which has been continued in the succeeding Councils: The Council of *Trent* curses them heartily, it's well for them poor Heretics, the Curse causeless comes not; for ever since the Beast got into the World has wander'd after her, the Anabaptists have been for the Antichristian Arrows to fly at.



what hath here been premis'd, I hope the serious and moderate will see, that as there is neither Precept nor Prescript in the holy Scriptures to countenance Infant Baptism, so neither can it be inferr'd by any just Consequence from any thing therein. And indeed it cannot be suppos'd, that these sacred Lines countenance a Practice, which is in Contradiction to it's own Nature: And such to be sure that Practice is, as shall yet further appear from Arguments, taken from the Contrariety thereof to the holy Scripture.

### Argument the Twelfth.

That the Language of holy Scriptures, that the Lord's Ministers cannot warrantably baptize any, but such whom they first by teaching make Christ's Disciples, then the baptizing of Infants is in Contradiction to the holy Scripture:

That the Language of holy Scriptures, that the Lord's Ministers cannot warrantably baptize any, but such whom they first by teaching make Disciples to Christ:

That the baptizing of Infants is in Contradiction to the holy

Scripture of *Mathew* and *19 v.* And *John* 4. 1. do fully secure the Proposition, as indeed doth the whole History of the Apostles, so that I have nothing to support but the Authority of the Major, which I shall do by the following

That you cannot in the Power of the Lord's Ministers to make little Children the Lord's Disciples by teaching them, then the Conclusion of the Major is true:

That you cannot in the Power of the Lord's Ministers to make little Children the Lord's Disciples by teaching them—Therefore &c.

It is evident that the Command which our Lord Jesus gave his Ministers, doth require them first to teach, and then to baptize them whom they had taught, and by teaching made his Disciples. And as he was according to their Practice before our Saviour's Birth, so he was after. As he saith *John* 4. 1. he made and baptized more Disciples than he himself (mark) he first made Disciples, and then baptized them. And he first taught them, and thereby made them Disciples; and his Practice he recommends to his Ministers, and commands them to observe after his Ascension.

And *Jerome* on this Text saith "that tho the Word be translated yet in the Original it properly imports to Disciple or Disciples; as if he should have said, go ye and Disciple all Nations, and bring them over to be my Disciples, and baptize them: And in his private Thoughts on the same Text he saith, "the words I take to be this; go ye and preach the Gospel to all Nations, and endeavour thereby to bring them to the embracing of it, that leaving all Jewish Ceremonies and

and Heathenish Idolatries they may profess my Name, come my Disciples, receive the Truth and follow me, they do I charge you to baptize them in the Name of the Father and holy Ghost; for the word doth not signify to teach, but to baptize, denoting the same here as that doth upon the occasion, *John* 4. 1. Jesus made and baptized more Disciples. *John*. And this is the Sense that all the antient Translations in, nor indeed will the Text it self bear any other, special that of teaching; for tho the Apostles should have taught them, yet they were not presently to baptize them unless they came Disciples and Professors of the Doctrines that they taught. A Man may be taught the Doctrine of the Gospel yet not believe it; and even tho' he should believe it, yet he openly professes his Faith in it, he ought not presently to be baptiz'd; for without this outward Profession, the very Name of Christ cannot intitle a Man to this Privilege before Men, tho' doth before God; because we cannot know how any stand to Christ, but by their outward Profession of him. The outward Profession of Christ that intitles us to the inward spiritual Grace; but it is the outward Profession of him only that intitles us to the outward visible Sign in Baptism &c.

Thus far the Bishop, with which Dr *Whitby* in his Exposition of this Text well agrees; to which I desire my Reader will be satisfied.

This is most certain, that it is with the Heart Man believeth, and with the Mouth Confession of that Faith must be made to God, and whoever reads with proper attention, the History of the Apostles, will see that they thus understood their Commission, that they were first to make Men and Women Disciples by teaching them, and then to baptize them; which Commission they always observed, *Acts* 2. 37 to 41. They first preached to the *Hebrews*, and when they had gladly received the Word, and were persuaded to embrace the Lord Jesus, they were baptized. The 8th Chapter of the *Acts* shews us, that they preach'd the Kingdom of Christ to the *Samaritans*, and when they were persuaded to believe *Philip's* Doctrine and to become Disciples, in making a Profession of that Faith, they were baptized both Men and Women: The same Method was observed with the *Ethiopian Eunuch*; also with *Cornelius* and those that were with him, *Acts* 10. The like with *Lydia* and the *Taylor* *Acts* 16. The 19th Chapter shews us, the same Method was observ'd by *Paul* and *Timotheus* in the City of *Corinth*; they preached the Gospel and persuaded them to believe it, and to make a Profession of that Faith, and so become Christ's Disciples; which done they baptized both Men and Women. This Order was preserved almost generally for four hundred Years, and continued in the Church to this very Day. *Justin Martyr's Apology* is a strong evidence to the Practice of his time. He shews they first made People to believe the Doctrine preach'd to them, and then made them Christ's Disciples, and then baptized them as the

them to do. This order our Conscience compels us who ed Anabaptists, to observe with the utmost exactness in er, as believing otherwise to act, will be in Contradiction oly Scripture, which will as I conceive yet further appear following Argument.

### Argument the Thirteenth.

Law which commands Water Baptism, doth command an the Person to be baptiz'd, then the baptizing of Infants contradiction to the holy Scriptures:

Law which commands Water Baptism, doth command in the Person to be baptized:

ere the baptizing of Infants is in Contradiction ro the tures.

nor of this Argument hath the whole of the new Testa- defend it; for from thence it is manifest that the Com- Baptism doth not only require an Action in the Minister but also it requires an Action in the Person to be bap- is ( and that most justly ) expected to be active, as e Administrator. *Acts 2. 38. Peter said, Repent and be* *Acts 22. 16. Annanias said to Paul, Brother Saul, why tar- rise and be baptized.*

ed Redeemer in commanding Men to be active unto whom ism is to be administred, doth not lead them with a bea- which he himself refus'd to touch with the tip of his Fin- has made himself a remarkable Example of a cheerful ience to his Father's Will, fulfilling all Righteousness arly that of Baptism. He did not send for *John* from alilee to baptize him, but he took a Journey from Ga- u to *John* to receive Baptism from him, there in the he waited upon his Ministry, and he press'd earnestly removing all *John's* Objections which stood on the foot worthiness, and would not on any Pretence whatso- his Refusal, as may be seen in that Discourse which en them on this Subject. *Math. 3.*

d with a pleasing and affecting admiration remark Activity in going into the Water with *John*, an Ac- ceptableness of which, his Father bore Testimony; ascended the Banks of *Jordan*, the Spirit of God descended upon him; an Action, in which he is ated a glorious Patern and Example to Mankind, at his just Expectations of them, that they should only in qualifying themselves for Baptism, but nest in pressing for it when they have qualify'd receive it; looking upon it as a thing of such that if they have not a Conveniency near them, travel many Miles to obtain it, from a firm Per-  
G  
surrection

suasion of Mind that it behoves them to fulfil all Rites, and which they cannot do without it.

True it is *John the Baptist* endeavour'd to accomodate himself much as might be to the Conveniencies of the People: for he did not always continue in one Place; he staid for a Time in the Wilderness of *Judea* at *Jordan* for the Benefit of *Jerusalem* and the Regions round about; from whence the People, properly active, came out to him and were baptized of him confessing their Sins; from thence he removed to *Bethabara* *Jordan* for the Advantage of the adjacent Country, and continued there for a Time, he went to *Enon* near *Salon* Places where there was much Water, Rivers proper for the Administration of the Ordinance, and so well suited to the use of his Ministry; for a Bason, the Popish Invention of the last Century was not thought of in his Time.

Now as from this Relation of *John's* moving from place to place we learn that Christ's Ministers must accomodate themselves much as may be, and in the best manner they can to the convenience of Mankind, so we learn from Men's going out to his Quarters to receive Baptism from him in the place where he minister'd it, that it is God's Expectation that Men shall in the receipt of the best Accomodations that Ministers can give must be willing if need so requires, to travel many Miles to receive Baptism rather than to be without it, for this is most conformable to the Law which commands Baptism, doth as well command the Party to be baptized as it commands an Active Minister to baptize; and accordingly they were active in the foregoing Examples, and as the following Texts of Scripture prove. *Math. 3.* throughout. *John 1. 28.* *Chap 3. 23.* *Chap 16. 13.*

The Commission doth not oblige Ministers to baptize without the Consent of the Party; and if they could use Force would be of no saving Advantage to the Party; they must themselves move freely to God-ward; for religion is founded in Personal Persuasion, as Mr. *Abernethy* excellently well shewn us, and that all external Persuasion which the Mind persuades not, is an Abomination to God.

The Commission doth as well call for Obedience in the Party to be baptized, as in the Minister to whom the Commission is given; it is their Business to be active in their application for Baptism, and thereupon Ministers are ty'd by the Commission to give Baptism to such, against whom they have no objections. All which consider'd, the Minor Proposition is true, and have nothing to make good but the Consequence of the Major to which Purpose I further Argue.

If little Infants be altogether passive in the Sacrament and have it not in their Power to give any active consent to Christ therein, then the Consequence of the Major is



## Christian Baptism.

41

little Infants are altogether passive in the Sacrament of Baptism: have it not in their Power to give any active Obedience therein:—Therefore &c. as was to be proved, and which may otherwise be proved thus.

Active and passive Obedience, which any Person pays to absolutely insignificant, in which the Soul or inward Man is passive, or without spiritual Activity to God-ward, the Consequence of the Major is true, the former, is true—Therefore the latter.

Now, that in Baptism the Infant is altogether passive, so far, as it discovers its Dislike to it by crying, which is so; for violence and a superior Power forceth it to that, it has no Inclination.

The poor innocent Infant is passive in Body, it is also so in giving no Consent to the thing: Now how acceptable to God it can be; every Man should wisely consider, and judge by Judgment.

To make this Matter yet more plain, and give a greater Reasoning, I shall state the foregoing Argument otherwise.

A Law which requires Water Baptism, doth speak preceptively to a Person to be baptiz'd, then the Baptism of little Infants is in Contradiction to the holy Scriptures:

A Law which requires Water Baptism, doth speak preceptively to a Person to be baptized:

The baptizing little Infants is in Contradiction to the Scriptures.

And the Consequence of the Major of this Argument, is true.

An infinitely wise and just God did never speak by any Law to little Infants, then the Consequence of the Major

is true: An infinitely wise and just God did never speak by any Law to little Infants:—Therefore &c. as was to be proved.

It is already observed that the Gospel of Christ doth speak preceptively to Mankind, commanding them to be baptized, as it speaks preceptively to Ministers commanding them to baptize. Shall we entertain such a wild, and unbecoming Notion, as to suppose that it would consist with his infinite Justice, to make a Law which should be binding to all, or binding to any who want the Power of Obedience; it is most unreasonable to suppose it, because such a Law would bear any Penalty, for a Subject is unpunishable who is impossible; hence we say, that Infants are not subject to no Law, and the Reason is plain, because they are not of exercising their Reason. That glorious God who is more just than to command blind Men to see, or dumb Men to speak; for just Commands

always suppose Power of Obedience. All which consider'd Man shall say that little Infants are liable to any Punishment account of their not being baptized or that Baptism being beyond the Time of Infancy shall be attended with any consequences, dangerous to little Infants; I must believe, that Man's Ignorance is too great to find a Center any where but

Very hard is that Man's Thought, who has a hard Thought of a little harmless Infant, of whom Christ hath said of such is the Kingdom of Heaven: And further, that *whosoever is not converted as like a little Child, he shall in no wise enter into it.* From this must conclude, that the Law which commands Water Baptism command *some* to be baptized, but doth not command Infants to be baptized; and that consequently the Practice of baptizing Infants is not only without a Command from Christ, but it is in opposition to it, which speaks preceptively to those who are the Subjects of Baptism. And as the Practice of baptizing Infants is contrary to the holy Scriptures, so also it is contrary to the Practice of the primitive Christians in the first and purest Ages of the Gospel, as I have already shewn, and shall now further argue against Infant's Right to Baptism, taken from the Practice of the primitive Christians.

### Argument the Fourteenth.

If it was the Opinion of the primitive Christians in the purest Ages of the Gospel, that it was too early to administer Baptism in Infancy, then the baptizing of Infants is both contrary to the Sense and Practice of the primitive Christians, in the purest Ages of the Gospel.

But it was the Opinion of the primitive Christians, in the purest Ages of the Gospel, that it was too early to administer Baptism in Infancy.

Therefore the baptizing of Infants is both contrary to the Sense and Practice of the primitive Christians in the first and purest Ages of the Gospel.

I am persuaded that those Gentlemen, in Opposition to this Argument, will allow that this Argument is good, and must have Force against Infant's Right to Baptism, provided the Proposition be defended; wherefore in Defence of it I shall argue.

If it was the Custom of the ancient Christians, in the purest Ages of the Gospel, to keep their Children at home until they were well instructed in the Articles of the Christian Faith, before they baptized them; then it is evident that the Opinion of the primitive Christians, that it was too early to administer Baptism in Infancy.

But it was the Custom of the ancient Christians, in the purest Ages of the Gospel, to keep their Children at home until they were well instructed in the Articles of the Christian Faith, before they baptized them;

fore it is most manifest that it was the Opinion of the Christians, that it was too early to administer Baptism, as was to be proved.

we take the forgoing Argument more briefly, thus.

ought not to account those Persons the Subjects of Water to whom the primitive Christians in the first and purest the Gospel deny'd it.

the primitive Christians in the first and purest Ages of the did refuse Water Baptism to little Infants:

we ought not to account them the Subjects of it.

hardly think that any of the candid and knowing among baptists, will put me upon the Proof of the Minor Proposition, because there is such a vast Number of the Learned of every Party, who do not only allow it, but have also plainly and fully affirm'd it. I shall content my self with mentioning a very few of them.

in his primitive Christianity gives us a large Account of the Customs in the early Ages of the Gospel, and how they had their Children by that laudable Practice of Catechism well instructed in the Articles of the Christian Creed before they were baptized; Baptism being delay'd to several of them they were thirty Years of Age; and to this Account of a great Number of our English Writers, as well as other who are all Pedobaptists; as every Man will find, who for the Truth's Sake, will do himself the Favour of consulting Stennet's Answer to Mr. David Ruffen, Mr. Benj. Keach's Answer, and Dr. Gale's Remarks on Dr. Wall's History of Infants.

Further particularizing of Persons, the next whose Evidence shall be called for upon this Point, shall be *Curcellanus*, whose Evidence is given in these Words.

Baptism was not known in the World in the two first Ages of Christianity, in the third and fourth it was approved by a few, at the fifth and following Ages it began to obtain in divers Places, and therefore we observe this Rite indeed as an antient custom, but not as an *Apostolical Tradition*. And in another place he says the Custom of baptizing Infants did not begin before the third Age after Christ, and there appears not the least Footing of it in the two first Centuries.

his Account and Confession of *Curcellanus* doth well agree with the Account of Dr. Barlow Bishop of Lincoln, in his Letter to Mr. Keach, where the truth is (saith he) I believe, that Infants Baptism was not used in the Church in the second Century how or by whom, and in the third and fourth it began to be practis'd, generally; for sure I am, that in the first Ages they were first Catechized, and then Illuminati, that is, they were first Catechized and then Baptiz'd.

In the Evidence of these two great Men, I shall subjoin the Evidence of *Justin Martyr* to the Emperor *Antoninus Pius*, on the Behalf

half of the Christians, in which Apology he gives this of their Practice.

"As many as are persuaded and do believe those things  
"them to be true, we admonish them to Fast and Pray,  
"Fast and Pray along with them; then we bring them to  
"ter, and in the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost  
"are washed in the Water.

Surely it must be admitted, that this Apology of *Justin* doth shew what was the Practice of the Church in his Time which corresponds with the Practice of the baptized (commonly call'd *Anabaptists*) at this Day. For they are same Opinion with him, as also of *Basil the Great*, who are *viz.* "Faith and Baptism are two Means of Salvation ly allied and inseperable; for Faith is perfected by "and Baptism is founded upon Faith.

Here I might bring in a Clond of Evidences in Support of this Minor Proposition of this last Argument, all Ge tlemen and Credit; but I refer my Reader to Mr. *Joseph Stennet Keach*, Col. *Henry Danvers*, Dr. *Gale*, *Delaun's* Plea for the Conformist, and shall here only add that memorable Story of *Athenatius*, so particularly noted in History, which I think myself alone be sufficient; The Story is this. When *Athenatius* but a Boy and playing with a Number of other Boys, who with himself were Catecumens, these Boys in their Play represented themselves into a Kind of Church Body; one Part of them represented the Church, who chose *Athenatius* for their Bishop; another Part of them represented the Catecumens, and these were to be examin'd by *Athenatius* the Bishop, to be catechiz'd as Candidates for Baptism; upon which, they answering to the Satisfaction of the new made Bishop and Church, in prosecution of their Baptism *Athenatius* went with them into the River and baptiz'd them.

This Story doth plainly shew us, what the Custom of the Church was in *Athenatius's* Time, in Reference to the administration of this great Ordinance of the Gospel, both with respect to the Substance and Manner of it's administration.

As to the Mode of administration, that it was not by sprinkling a little Water upon the Face, or any other part of the Body, the *Popish* Canon in the thirteenth Century makes sufficient Evidence that it was perform'd in a River, as in the Apostles Time: And as to the Subjects of Baptism, it is evident they were such as had been in the Station of Catecumens, and so made acquainted with the Principles of the Christian Religion. Of which number of Catecumens *St. Austin*, *St. Hierom*, *St. Ambrose*, as Dr. *Taylor* Bishop of *Down* owns in his *Liberty of Prophecy* p. 330 to 333. where he serves the Bishop says that the Necessity of Infants Baptism was determin'd in the Church until the eighth Age after Christ.

Mr. *Delaune* in his Plea for the Non-Conformist brings in a learned French Man to evidence that Baptism in the Apostles Times was delay'd to the Children of Christian Parents



an advanc'd Age ; which he collects from the History of  
*Valentinian, Gratian, Theodosius*, who were in the third  
 Century ; in whose time a corrupt opinion obtain'd  
 that Sins after Baptism could not be forgiven, which  
 Reason they deferr'd their Baptism until they thought  
 near their Death, as fearing they might commit Sin

Authorities are more than sufficient to secure the Minor  
 of my Argument, which affirms that the primitive Chris-  
 the first and purest Ages of the Gospel, did refuse Water  
 to little Infants, and from which we may justly infer the  
 what is affirm'd in the Major, which is, that Baptism  
 to be administer'd to them ; and tho' we do not pin  
 upon the Sleeves of the great Men of those Times, but  
 holy Scriptures the Ground of our religious Persuasion,  
 ink that a Continuance of the Practice of baptizing Infants  
 too little Regard to the gray Hairs and grave Opini-  
 se reverend Grandfathers of the Christian Church.

now apply my self to reason against Infants Right to Bap-  
 the Inconveniencies into which it leads Christian Com-  
 which are many, but I shall mention only a few of them.

### Argument the Fifteenth.

Practice of baptizing Infants, hath a natural Tendency  
 Christian Communities into Confusion and Disorder, then  
 it is a Practice which is not of God, who hath de-  
 self a God of Order and not of Confusion.

Practice of baptizing of Infants, hath a natural Tenden-  
 Christian Communities into Confusion and Disorder ;  
 &c.

ce of the Minor Proposition I further argue.

Practice of baptizing Infants doth put it out of the Pow-  
 an Communities to know, whether several of the Mem-  
 le Communities were ever baptiz'd or not ; then it is  
 it is a Practice, which hath a natural Tendency to  
 an Communities into Confusion and Disorder.

Practice of baptizing of Infants, doth put it out of the  
 Christian Communities to know whether several of the  
 those Communities were ever baptiz'd or not ; —  
 re, as was to be proved. Consequently it is not of  
 hath declar'd himself to be a God of Order and not

onableness of this Argument will appear, when it is  
 at there are a vast Number of Souls in all the Nations  
 well as in other Quarters of the World, who have had  
 ism, but what has been privately administer'd ; pri-  
 pgs ( so call'd ) being now so very common among  
 our



## Christian Baptism.

47

the Doctrine and Practice of baptizing Infants, doth put Communities under a necessity of building with one Hand, what Conscience compels them to endeavour the Destruction of with the other :

For the Doctrine and Practice of baptizing Infants cannot be good the Minor Proposition, I further argue.

the Doctrine or Practice which puts Protestant Communities under a necessity of countenancing the Roman Antichristian Baptism, which they most justly protest against, is a Doctrine or Practice which puts Protestant Communities under a necessity of building with one Hand, what Conscience compels them to endeavour the Destruction of with the other, in Opposition to the Errors

the Doctrine and Practice of baptizing of Infants, doth put Communities under a necessity of countenancing the Roman Antichristian Baptism, which they most justly protest

the Doctrine and Practice of baptizing of Infants, is a Doctrine and Practice which puts Protestant Communities under a necessity of building with one Hand, what Conscience compels them to endeavour the Destruction of with the other, in Opposition to the Errors of *Rome*.

If the Argument be deny'd, the following Argument will secure it.

the Doctrine and Practice which puts Protestant Communities under a necessity of countenancing the Roman Antichristian Sign of the Cross, the use of Cream, Spittle, Salt &c. in the Administration of Baptism, is a Doctrine and Practice which puts Protestant Communities under a necessity of countenancing the Roman Doctrine and Practice of baptizing of Infants, which they most justly protest against.

the Doctrine and Practice of baptizing of Infants is such a Doctrine and Practice as puts Protestant Communities under a necessity of countenancing the Roman Antichristian Sign of the Cross, the use of Cream, Spittle, Salt &c. in the Administration of

the Doctrine and Practice of baptizing of Infants, is a Doctrine and Practice, as puts Protestant Communities under a necessity of countenancing the Roman Doctrine of Baptism.

drawn up against the Practice of baptizing of Infants in this Argument, and the Argument it self will shew that Protestant Communities

drawn up against the Practice of baptizing of Infants in this Argument, and the Argument it self will shew that Protestant Communities

drawn up against the Practice of baptizing of Infants in this Argument, and the Argument it self will shew that Protestant Communities

H

protest

protest against, and that most justly too, on the account of many Superstitions which Apostate Rome hath tack'd to it as before. All which Anti-scriptural, Anti-Christian Superstitions Protestants by continuing the Practice of baptizing of Infants under a necessity of countenancing: For should they do otherwise and deny the Roman Baptism to be good, and upon the same ing Popish Profelites should give them what they believe the right Scriptural, or Christian Baptism, they would probably upon themselves a Charge of re-baptizing, and fall into the serious Heresy of *Ana-baptism*, a Crime for which no Absolution be hoped for from Rome, tho' it be remark'd that the Greeks notwithstanding Pedobaptists; yet believing that *Rantism*, or sprinkling a little Water upon the Face, is not the manner of administering of Baptism, they refuse to communicate with the same. The Account of their not being rightly baptiz'd, and yet learn that the *Greeks* are afraid to be call'd Anabaptists.

I conceive this is a Point on which the Pedobaptists should shew some of their serious Thoughts, for most certainly they either believe the Roman Baptism is good, or they do not. If they do believe it to be good, should they not then practice it? however at least, surely they ought not to protest against it. If they do not believe it to be good, why do they give so much countenance to it? why do they not with the *Greeks* refuse to communicate with them, until they are baptiz'd, as they appear the holy Scriptures doth direct? perhaps some solid Thoughts on this Subject may lead them to see what the Practice of Pedobaptism brings them to.

Oh how many and how great are those Inconveniences which this groundless, this *Anti-scriptural*, this useless and insignificant thing, call'd Infant's Baptism, doth lead Christians to. Groundless I call it, because it hath nothing in Scripture or Reason to support it. *Anti scriptural* I call it, because it is contrary to the Scripture, as I have already shewn, and shall further shew.

Useless and insignificant I call it, because the little Infant receives no manner of Benefit from it; for if it dies in its Infancy, its Salvation is secur'd without it; and if it pass the Time of its Infancy, it has no spiritual Privilege from it, since it cannot be admitted to the holy Communion of the Church, until an intelligent, and solemn Promises shall qualify it for that.

To what I have already mentioned as Inconveniences which it leads Christian Communities, I may further add as another, that it puts them under an unnecessary obligation to cast away Christian Discipline, which is not only the Church's Honour, but the Churches Bulwark and one of its chief Ornaments. A heavy Charge, but the following Argument I conceive makes it appear to be just, which I hope every Christian will consider.



## Argument the Seventeenth.

Doctrine and Practice of baptizing Infants, doth put it  
the Power of Christian Communities, to keep up Christian  
in those Communities, then it is a Doctrine and Practice  
not of God :

Doctrine and Practice of Infant's Baptism, doth put it out  
the Power of Christian Communities, to keep up Christian Dis-  
cipline in those Communities — Therefore &c.  
The good the Minor Proposition, I further argue

the Doctrine and Practice of baptizing Infants, doth lay  
Communities under a necessity of bearing with those things  
Members of those Communities which by the Christian Laws  
are to be born with ; then the Doctrine and Practice of  
Infants doth put it out of the Power of Christian Com-  
munities to keep up Christian Discipline in those Communities :  
the Doctrine and Practice of baptizing Infants, doth lay  
Communities under a necessity of bearing with those things  
Members of their Communities, which by the Christian Laws  
are to be born with.

the Doctrine and Practice of baptizing Infants doth  
the Power of Christian Communities to keep up Chris-  
tian Discipline in those Communities, as was to be proved.

that in undertaking the Defence of this Charge, I  
full of tender and Christian Compassion to the Pedo-  
baptists, I could wish with all my Soul, for the Sake of many  
of them, that the Charge was false : But we have so many  
silly and notorious Instances of the Truth thereof, as  
all Parties concern'd to take the Shame to themselves,  
Glory to God, in owning that the Charge is too true.  
I believe that every Man who deals justly with Christ,  
and his Soul, in paying a proper Regard to the Honour of Re-  
ligion, will acknowledge that this Argument carries force in it against  
the Charge of Baptism, provided the Article of Charge contain'd  
the Proposition, can be made good : If it be fairly proved  
that Christian Communities under a necessity of casting a  
Discipline, in bearing with those Things in the Mem-  
bers of their Communities, which by the Christian Laws ought  
not to be born with, but this is too easily proved.

That Childhood and Youth are Vanity. And the  
Scripture says, that while we are Children, we speak and act as Chil-  
dren, until we become Men, we do not put away childish things.  
That Children have their childish ways of acting and  
thinking, surely we must all agree in this, that all Christians  
Members of Christian Churches, should be Men  
in their Speech, and Children only in Malice, and other par-  
tialities.

It is known by sad Experience that when we pass the Childhood, we too generally become like an unteam'd He accustom'd to the Yoak, and it is very rare to find one who bear the Yoak in Youth: For that they rather choose to run ly into all the Follies and idle Extravagancies of it, all while Christian Communities who contend for Infant's Baptism, der a necessity of bearing with; in those who by Baptism were Members of their Communities. They must not only be the Vanity of Childhood, until about ten Years of Age, but thence forward, with all the intollerable Excesses of unteam'd such as Swearing Cursing, calling one another scandalous Names; fighting with one another; devoting themselves and other idle Flesh pleasing Pastimes, and that on the Lord's as well as other Days, for all Days are alike to them, so that scarcely possible for a small Number of sober Men and Women meet together in the most peaceable Manner for divine worship without being disturb'd by those young Pedobaptists, the Members of Christian Communities

This is what I have been made to experience in that Society, among whom I worship the God of my Fathers, notwithstanding we are under a Government as tender of tender Conscience can reasonably be desir'd, and under Laws calculated to preserve us our religious as well as civil Liberties; but alas what can God or Man can tame them, for it is their Sport, and what to us they seem to have Pleasure in taking Advantage of Condition to which an Enemy has reduc'd us.

It's an occasion of Lamentation to observe how thoughtless are of God and Christ, how miserably regardless of Judgment, and without any outward Sign of one serious of Eternity; and yet all these are Members of Christian Communities, and never laid under Church Censure for any irregularities, so dishonourable to the Gospel of Christ; so foul to the Christian Name; so contrary to the Christian Law; so disagreeable to a baptismal Vow, and so injurious to their own Souls; yet as they grow up in Wickedness, they seem to be possess'd with a false devotion whilst persuaded that in their Baptism they were made Christ, Children of God, and Inheritors of the Kingdom

Doth not our Lord Jesus by his Apostles strictly withdraw from every Brother who walketh disorderly: the Church purged of the Leaven of Wickedness, by driving profane Persons to Satan, for the destruction of the Flesh, knowing that evil Communication corrupts good Manners, and that a corrupt Vessel will I ven the whole Lump. And shall all those Brethren Sisters be born with, in all their disorderly walking? O Heavens! at the Confusion and intollerable Inconvenience which this needless Practice of baptizing Infants doth to Christian Communities.

Parties say that Baptism was instituted for the solemn Admission of the Party baptized into the visible Christian Church, useful Admission! Infants by Baptism are made Members of the Church and yet are no Members of it; they are in the Church and yet out of the Church; they are Members of the Church without having a Right to the Communion of the Church, being Subject to the Government of the Church, or liable to be censured by her Authority for any of their Misdemeanors, making Church Membership!

Pedobaptists! do you keep the Members of your Church in Communion, when they pass the Age of seven, eight, or nine years? Is it because you think they are not fit for Christian Communion, because of that vain idle Life you observe them to live? If this be indeed the Cause, I pray what good doth their Baptism do them at the same Time? what are they the better for being persuaded to take *Tertullians* Advice and defer their Baptism? They know what Baptism is, until they are regenerated and united with Christ for themselves, that they may be the better by their Baptism, and grow better after it; in dying to Sin and to Unrighteousness, and not as it is with those whom you baptize (if you baptize at all) who never fail to grow worse and more inclined daily to that which is good, and rising to a Life of Piety and Profaneness, and so they continue until they are consumed, which doth not happen to Multitudes of them; for the Majority of them continue in their Wickedness to the end of their Days. All which consider'd, makes way for me to argue yet more strongly against Infant's Right to Baptism.

### Argument the Eighteenth.

That Doctrine which makes Persons growing worse and worse after Baptism unavoidable, rather than better and better; to live in Sin, rather than to die to Sin, cannot be sound Doctrine:

That Doctrine of Infant's Baptism doth make Persons growing worse and worse after Baptism unavoidable, rather than better and better; to live in Sin, rather than die to Sin—Therefore &c. To support and make good the Minor Proposition, I further argue.

That Doctrine which makes it unavoidable, that all the Sins of Mankind become guilty of, must come after Baptism, doth make Persons growing worse and worse after Baptism unavoidable, rather than better and better; to live in Sin, rather than die to Sin.

That Doctrine of Infant's Baptism doth make it unavoidable, that all the Sins which Mankind becomes guilty of, must needs come after Baptism:—Therefore &c. as was to be proved.

I added that none will misunderstand me, and suppose I here intended that the baptizing of Infants has in it self any causal Influence upon the Lives of such as were baptiz'd in Infancy so as to make it the Cause of that Wickedness, into which they afterwards run.

run as they grow up in Years, or that it puts them under any unavoidable necessity of Sinning; for I mean no more than that it puts them under an unavoidable necessity of committing all the Sins they are capable of committing after Baptism, because it is impossible for them to commit any of that Sin before; for being baptiz'd in Infancy without Power of Action, without Power of Speech, and without Power of Thought or Reason, it was impossible for them to commit Sin.

And now let us observe how vastly different the Doctrine of Pedobaptism is from the Scriptural Doctrine of Baptism. The Doctrine of Pedobaptism, as we have seen, makes Persons growing and worse after Baptism unavoidable; but the Scriptural Doctrine of Baptism is, that Persons baptized are to be accounted free from Sin, and that it is justly expected that they should live no more therein, but that being planted together with Christ, in the Buriall of his Death and Resurrection, they are supposed dead to Sin, and of them it is requir'd, that they should rise with him to a new and holy Life, to seek those things that are above, through the Operation of God. *Rom. 6 throughout. Col. 2. And Chap. 3. 1. 2.*

But secondly it may be observ'd from some Writers of the Pedobaptists, that in the fourth Century an Opinion prevailed among some Christians, (in which number are plac'd the Emperors *Constantine, Valentinian, Theodosius*) that Sins committed after Baptism could not be forgiven, mistaking the Sense of the Apostles Words *1 Cor. 6. 11.* In Consequence of which they deferr'd their Baptism until they thought they were near their Death; which by the way, as we have seen, they were very far from being of Opinion, that Infants were the Subjects of Baptism: For it is impossible such Persons should be so fond of baptizing Infants, who were persuaded that Sins committed after Baptism could not be forgiven; because such a Principle concludes, that a greater Advantage would arise from the delay of Baptism to old Age, than from too early an Administration of it. The Pedobaptists seem to run, and that most extravagantly, to the contrary Extream, as if it was their Opinion that Sins committed before Baptism could not be forgiven, and that in Consequence of this, they resolve to administer it to Infants, before they have Power to commit Sin at all.

The true Mean between those Extreams may be seen in the Practice of the baptiz'd Churches, who are call'd Anabaptists. They have a strict Adherence to the Doctrines of the Apostles, expressing *Ambrosius*'s Advice to defer Baptism, until the Person baptiz'd knows what it is, and to what a holy way of living it binds him. As far as it is possible all the Sins a Man commits may be forgiven by Baptism, and yet that he may be as early in his Application to it, as possibly may be, that God may be remembered in his Mercy, that Men may give the best of their Days to him unto whom they ought to be given; that from the Time of their Baptism they may have their Resolution to live to God in Righteousness, and to follow the Lord Jesus Christ.



that a just regard to the Credit of the Gospel, and of the Religion whereof the Son of God is the Author, would on all the Pedobaptists, specially those who are Protestants, heartily on this Subject, and carefully search out the Truth and not rest satisfied in what was done for them in Infancy, their own Consent, as if those few Drops of Water with they were so early RANTIZED, were sufficient to the hottest Flames of the Wrath of God, and to atone those Sins they become guilty of, after they pass the time of Infancy; too, too many of them seem to act as if some such Thoughts as these: A Consideration whereof, a further Argument against Infant's Right to Baptism.

### Argument the Nineteenth.

Doctrine which puts Persons at least under a Temptation, or a necessity, to receive either Error for Truth, or Truth upon a wrong Foundation, is an unsound and dangerous Doctrine.

The Doctrine of Infant Baptism, doth put Persons under a Temptation at least, if not under a necessity, to receive either Error for Truth, or Truth upon a wrong Foundation: — There-

fore the following Argument secures the Minor Proposition.

The Doctrine which puts Persons under a Temptation at least, or a necessity, to take up their Satisfaction in what was done for them in Infancy, without ever inquiring whether it was true, is a Doctrine which puts them under a Temptation at least, if not under a necessity, to receive either Error for Truth, or Truth upon a wrong Foundation:

The Doctrine of Infant's Baptism, is such a Doctrine: — as was to be proved.

If the Article of Impeachment be proved true, the Conclusion will be true also, viz. that the Doctrine of Infants Baptism is an unsound and dangerous Doctrine.

Thought and Observation may remark, that among the great Numbers of Souls which compose the Body of the Pedobaptists, and all Denominations of Christians, there be whole Legions, whose Understandings were never consulted in the Choice of Religion; yea such as never made Choice of Religion, but take up their Satisfaction in that Religion which has been made for them, and which they never examin'd whether it was true: So that there is too much Reason to believe, that the Error they profess was never the Result of any regular Inquiry, but seem, yea rather more than seem to rest perpetually upon fixing what Religion they have (if we can justly say they have any) upon this Foundation, that it is the Religion which their Fathers were in possession of, when they came into the World, and into which they were baptized, and thereby make it

it most lamentably evident, that they have no other Religion, than what lies in the very Name of the Parents they belong to.

One Man is a *Mahometan* or a *Jew* because he was born so, neither is a *Christian* for no better Reason, and sucks in Religion at his Infancy, as he doth the Milk of his Mother's Breast.

Ask one Man what Religion he is of? and he will answer a *Roman Catholick*, ask him for what Reason he is of that Religion? and he knows nothing of the matter, only his Father and his Mother, and so was all his Family; and it is the Religion into which he was baptized, and which he was brought up in, and he knows right well (tho' he knows not his right from his left) that the Church of *Rome* is the holy Mother and is sure that she cannot Err, and that therefore it is his duty to believe as the Church believes, let her believe what she will. Over this is a thing of which he is very certain, that whoever refuses to hear the Voice of this the true Church of *Christ* curs'd Schismatick, a damo'd Heretick, and deserves to have his Flesh pick'd off his Bones with burning Pincers.

Ask another Man what Religion he is of? and he answers a *Protestant*: Ask him whether he be a *Presbyterian*, *Independant*, *baptist*, a *Quaker*, or what denomination of *Protestants* he be. He answers he is neither a *Presbyterian*, *Independant*, *Anabaptist*, nor a *Quaker*, but he is a *Protestant*: Ask him are not *Presbyterians*, *Anabaptists* and *Quakers*, *Protestants*, as well as others? No, those that are *Protestants*, are of the Church of *England* by establishment, as for others, they are *Presbyterians*, *Independants*, or *Quakers*, but they are no *Protestants*. Well, thus standeth with respect to all those who are turn'd out of the Name of *Protestants* to shift for themselves as well as they can, and this *Protestant*, for what Reason he is a *Protestant*? and he will answer with an Oath or Curse, that he was baptized with Faith: that his Parents before him were of that Religion, and is sure it is right, and that because it is impossible that learned Men who are *Protestants* should be mistaken.

Ask another Man, what Religion he is of? and (to repeat) speaking in his accustomed, loose, and profane Manner answers *Good Troth* (Quo' he) *I am a Presbyterian*. Ask him for what Reason he is a *Presbyterian*, rather than an *Independant*. Sol Mon (Quo' he) *because I was born one, and I was baptized with Faith, yea and I was begotten one, and my Father that begot me, and he himself also begotten a Presbyterian, and so we beget one another even from the Days of Adam, and therefore since I was born and brought up a Presbyterian, Dee'l tack me Mon* (Quo' he) *ere he any thing else then a Presbyterian; for I ken right well that the Religion of Scotland is God's Kirk, and that the Religion of the Kirk is God's Religion, and the only true Religion and way of Salvation, according to the National Covenant, and the solemn League and Covenant, signed by the Noble Men, Barons, Burgeses, Gentlemen and Ministers, all*

# Christian Baptism.

55

an ignorant Loon of a Fellow that supposes all of them could be  
 and that the Kirk of Scotland is not God's Kirk,  
 that none of the pious Pedobaptists, will misunderstand my  
 in representing many of their Party to express themselves  
 rothy and loose manner, as if it was my Design to reproach  
 the Body, and fasten it as a charge upon all, for I assure my  
 is far from me, as believing there be many of them who  
 fear an Oath, and do pay a spiritual Regard to the teach-  
 rist and his holy Evangelists, forbidding all Corruption  
 sation, and strictly requiring that our *Yea* should be *Yea*,  
*Nay*, *Nay*, for that *whatsoever is more than this, cometh of Evil*,  
 erly inconsistent with the pure Laws, and teachings of  
 y. I declare I have herein no other view, than lovinge  
 ke, and to become a friendly Adviser to such Persons  
 from themselves to such a loose way of Speech as is a  
 the Christian Name, and a Disgrace to that Profession  
 of Christ, Men that can scarcely talk one quarter of an  
 any Subject, without belching forth full Mouthfuls of  
 as these ( not fit to be us'd in common Conversation )  
 , *Conscience*, *Deel tak me*, *by my Sol*, *as I hope to be saved*, and  
 from which Custom I heartily wish that those Men who  
 d to be saved, and are under a Profession of Religion,  
 our to break themselves, for fear least a Continuance of  
 e Practice should be a hindrance of their Salvation.  
 urn to the Prosecution of my Design in the Defence of  
 nt, in shewing how Pedobaptism doth put Persons un-  
 ation at least, if not under a necessity to receive either  
 of Truth, or else Truth upon a wrong Foundation.  
 aded that Men of Consideration will say with me, it is  
 nifest that there are vast Numbers of the Pedobaptists,  
 ing themselves with what was done for them in Infan-  
 o what Religion they have upon Trust, without proper  
 in order to the Information of their Understanding.  
 Religion they have, and what religious Obedience  
 God, is very far from being founded in personal Per-  
 h is the only thing that can make it acceptable, as  
 has truly taught us. From all which it will fol-  
 e Kirks to which those ignorant Souls do join them-  
 ng, then they receive Error instead of Truth; ( if  
 id to receive it at all ) and supposing those Kirks to  
 Men receive Truth upon a wrong Foundation; in  
 ver inquire whether they be right or wrong, they  
 as the Apostle directs, whether they be in the Faith  
 content themselves with the Faith they have, because  
 n of their Fathers and Grandfathers, and because it  
 the Church, into which they were baptized, and  
 ere brought up from their Cradles.  
 oly Scriptures and right Reason teaches, that whoso-  
 e Religion upon this Foot, and not on the Foot of

a divine Revelation, so that it should be an Act of the Choice, as that to which a well inform'd Understanding well persuaded Mind directs them; if they happen to be they are right only by Chance, and not from any Reason have to their being either right or wrong: Which conclusion must be evident to every Man of Judgment, that if the of those Men be right, and they do receive the Truth, receive it upon a wrong Foundation, and so it will not be of ing Service to them; for that Religion only which will be vantage to any, is that which they choose themselves founded in personal Persuasion, and not that which is chosen them by others, and only received upon the Credit of Report, or upon Trust from them, altho' it should be granted and the only true Religion.

On an impartial Examination, or an honest and fair shall we not see Reason to believe, that all or the more of this lamentable Ignorance, is owing to the Practice of baptizing Infants? for if that Practice was deferred, as *Tertullian* advises, be, and in the primitive Ages was until that time of Learning when Men are able to think and judge for themselves, which have a right to do, and which also they are bound to do as their Thoughts should fix upon Eternity, they would have a Necessity of searching out the TRUTH in comparison of several differing Religions of Men with the holy Scriptures to which all should be brought, and applying themselves with possible Diligence to all other probable means of Knowledge, inquiring all things with an Intention (honest in the Sight of God) to hold fast that which shall appear to them to be good, and in order to get their Minds rightly persuaded, Religion would become an Act of their own Choice; after which if in the future they should happen to be mistaken, their Mistake would be their own; the Compassion of all reasonable compassionate Men must believe with *Mr. Abernathy*, will intitle them to the Compassion too; but to take up Religion upon Trust from the Recommendation of Father or Mother, or this or that learned Man or number of learned Men, without satisfying themselves by trying and proving from the Word of God chiefly, not slighting or neglecting any other probable Knowledge, and so determining themselves in their Conscience by such a fair Tryal and firm persuasion of their Minds, to take up Religion upon Trust without thus doing, is

He that is wise shall be wise for himself, he is a Man of Reason and will wisely consider, and thereby will yet become so if any Man be otherwise, and will not think for himself, but will refer himself to and be determined by the Judgment of another, such a Man must remain in inexcusable Ignorance, and it will not be in the power of any Man wise to relieve him.



I have shewn in sundry particulars the Inconveniencies in the Practice of baptizing Infants doth lead Christian Communities, to which I may add that it is a Practice which the Pedobaptists inconsistent with themselves, for Proof of further argue against it.

### Argument the Twentieth.

Doctrines which leads Christian Communities into an absolute Inconsistency with themselves, cannot be sound Doctrine:

Doctrines of Infant's Baptism doth lead Christian Communities into an absolute Inconsistency with themselves; —

&c.

Being good the Minor Proposition, I further argue.

Doctrines which being received by Christian Communities agree with other their Doctrines, is such a Doctrine as leads into an absolute Inconsistency with themselves.

Doctrines of Infants Baptism is such a Doctrine, as being received by Christian Communities, will not agree with their other Doctrines, specially in Reference to the Kirk of Scotland: —

&c.

Being good the Minor of this last Argument, I further argue.

Doctrines which being received by the Kirk of Scotland, agree with her Doctrine of final Perseverance, is such a Doctrine as being received by her, will not agree with her other Doctrines.

Doctrines of Infant's Baptism is such a Doctrine, which being received by the Kirk of Scotland, will not agree with her Doctrine of final Perseverance — Therefore &c.

Being good the Proposition of this last Argument may thus be made

Doctrines which teaches that such Persons who are regenerated into Christ, and interested in the Covenant of Grace, will totally and finally fall away from that State, is such a Doctrine as being received by the Kirk of Scotland, will not agree with her Doctrine of final Perseverance.

Doctrines of Infant's Baptism is such a Doctrine as teaches that Persons who are regenerated, ingrafted into Christ, and interested in the Covenant of Grace, can totally and finally fall away from that State: — Therefore &c. as was to be proved; and that it leads Christian Communities into an Inconsistency with themselves, and consequently cannot be sound Doctrine. That the Reason of this Charge may fairly appear, it is necessary to state the Kirk of Scotland's Doctrines of final Perseverance, as also her Doctrine of Infant's Baptism; that both taken together, the Inconsistency may discover it self.

Their Doctrine of final Perseverance must be supposed to be in its Connection with their Doctrines of Redemption, effectual Calling, Justification and Sanctification; and all must stand in agreement with their Doctrine of Election; and as their Doctrine of Election is, that God hath predestinated a Number of Men to everlasting Life, and that this Number is so certain and definite that it can neither be increas'd nor diminished; that this Number are redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified and saved, is regenerated, hath a new Heart and Spirit given them, for God having fore-ordain'd them to eternal Life, and them (pursuant to a Covenant of Grace) his holy Spirit enables them willing and able to believe; so that they being fallen from sin are redeemed by Christ, are effectually called to Faith in Christ by the almighty Power determined to that which is given through which Power they are kept, so that they neither can fall away totally and finally from that State of Grace, nor shall certainly persevere therein to the End and be eternally saved. And further they teach that none are redeemed, effectually justified, adopted, sanctified and saved, but the Elect only. I take to be the Kirk of Scotland's Doctrine of Election, final Perseverance &c. and her Doctrine of Infant's Baptism, or her Doctrine of Baptism in the General is, that it is not only a Sign, but an Ingrafting into Christ, of Regeneration, and a partaking of the Benefits of the Covenant of Grace.

Now since Baptism is such a Sign and Seal as here requires, it must thence be inferr'd, that Infants baptiz'd are ingrafted into Christ, are regenerated &c. And since their Doctrine of final Perseverance is, that all those who are ingrafted into Christ, are regenerated and are Partakers of the Benefits of the Covenant of Grace, shall certainly persevere to the End, and be eternally saved, it will follow (according to my way of thinking) that those Infants to whom Baptism was administered, did after Baptism remain in that State of Grace, in which their Baptism supplied them (as Multitudes of them have certainly done) and did not fall into a State of Wickedness to the End of their Lives, that the Kirk of Scotland's Doctrine of Infant's Baptism is inconsistent with her Doctrine of final Perseverance; and consequently false, if it is supposed that her Doctrine of final Perseverance is true, this to be sure is supposed by them, how much Reason and others may have to think the Contrary.

But again it may be observed that as the Kirk of Scotland's Doctrine of Infants Baptism is inconsistent with her Doctrine of final Perseverance so it is also inconsistent with her Doctrine of final Perseverance, if it is supposed that her Doctrine of final Perseverance is false, it is self, consequently false, as will further appear from the following Argument.

That Doctrine of the Kirk of Scotland which is inconsistent with her Doctrine of Baptism, is a Doctrine which makes the Kirk of Scotland inconsistent with her self.

Kirk of *Scotland's* Doctrine of Infant's Baptism, is inconsistent with the Kirk of *Scotland's* Doctrine of Baptism—  
 &c.,  
 of the Minor Proposition, I further argue.

Doctrine of the Kirk of *Scotland* which saith, any Person, visible Church hath a Right to Baptism, before Profession in, and Obedience to Christ, is inconsistent with the Kirk's Doctrine of Baptism.

Kirk of *Scotland's* Doctrine of Infants Baptism doth say, Persons out of the visible Church, hath a Right to Baptism, a Profession of Faith in, and Obedience to Christ—  
 &c., as was to be proved; and which proves that her Doctrine of Infant's Baptism doth lead her into an Inconsistency with herself.

Major Proposition is made good by the words of the Kirk in her larger and shorter Catechize, in which they say, that out of the visible Church are to be baptized until a Profession of Faith in, and Obedience to Christ, and tho' they say in one place and even in the same Breath, that those who are in Covenant of either both, or but one of them Believers are with-  
 out, and so have a Right to Baptism; yet will not these Words secure the Consistency, since in the Question before us, that the End for which Baptism is administer'd, is that they may be baptized, and be solemnly admitted into the visible Church, they shew they were out of the visible Church, until by Baptism they were solemnly admitted into it: Consequently seeing they were out of the visible Church at the time of their Birth, by the Question they ought not to be baptiz'd, until Profession of Faith and Obedience to Christ, and so the additional words in Covenant, and their having a Right on that Account, is significant, as wanting Power to preserve the Consistency, therefore to say that they have a Right, without a Profession of Faith and Obedience, is to say and unsay, and make inconsistent with her self.

It is saith that none out of the visible Church hath a Right to Baptism, until a Profession of Faith in, and Obedience to Christ, she gives us her Doctrine of Baptism in which she is consistent with the holy Scriptures, and the primitive Church. She saith that those who are Infants of either both, or but one of them believers are in Covenant, and so have a Right to Baptism, she gives us her Doctrine of Infant's Baptism, in which she is inconsistent, as neither agreeing with the holy Scriptures, the primitive Church, nor with her own self, which I could wish she who is a Presbyterian would consider.

Intent the Inconsistency with which the Kirk of *Scotland* is charged, may most fully and clearly evidence it self, I shall now dwell a little on some necessary Remarks on this Part

Part of the Catechize viz. " Infants descending from Parents either both or but one of them professing Faith in Christ and obedience to him, are in that Respect within the Covenant to be baptized.

I own my self persuaded that the Nation of Scotland and that of England and Ireland affords a great Number of very good Men, and Men of very great and exemplary Piety who love Lord Jesus Christ in Sincerity, and are not wilfully the Authors of Truth ; but I must at the same time believe, that there are Men, and liable to mistakes as are the rest of their Fellow Countrymen. So that not one of them has any just Reason to be displeased with the Man, who shall try their Doctrines and attempt to correct their supposed Mistakes, wherefore I hope the following will be candidly consider'd.

In this Position several things may be worth our Observation on which some Thoughts being spent will probably shed new Light into the grand Question.

First, this Conclusion doth most naturally flow from the Premises, viz. that those Infants whose Parents are neither Believers, are not in Covenant and so have no Right to Baptism which seems to bear very hard upon the innocent Infants of unbelieving Parents, since it must be granted it was none of their Faults if their Parents believed not ; wherefore supposing that all has any Right ( which in truth cannot be supposed ) to have Baptism generously be given to them all, and not one of them should be deprived for the Fault of the Parents, which poor harmless Infants want the Power to prevent.

Secondly, we will suppose that Infants do descend from Parents who are believers, so far as to make a Profession of the Christian Faith, and do also lead a sober godly Life as to their outward Conversation, yet were never by Baptism made Members of the visible Church, when the shorter Catechize is consider'd upon this Point it seems to be explanatory of the larger, it must be concluded that the Infants of such Parents ( notwithstanding their Parents' Faith and orderly conversation ) have no Right to Baptism, because they are no Members of the visible Church, for the shorter Catechize are, " that the Infants of those who are MEMBERS of the visible Church are to be baptized." I think is still hard, since it is none of the Infant's Fault if his Parents are not Members ; for I must account it very unreasonable to think that the Unbelief or Disobedience of Parents should render the Promises of God of none Effect to their Children, or deprive them of any Interest in those Promises, and must therefore be an Opinion, that this Article of the Kirk of Scotland does not give a different Representation of a merciful and just God, who in which he is pleas'd to give of himself, whose Throne is established with Justice, and whose tender Mercies are over all his Creatures, that he will not make an innocent Infant answerable for it's ungodly Parents.



of  
 m Pare  
 Christ  
 covenan  
 land as  
 of very  
 ety who  
 y the A  
 that the  
 Fellow  
 be disple  
 tempt to  
 following  
 r Observ  
 bably fac  
 low from  
 re neither  
 Right to  
 ent Infant  
 none of  
 ng that an  
 (supposed)  
 f them sho  
 poor harm  
 descend fr  
 tion of th  
 s to their  
 f the visib  
 pon this P  
 ust be con  
 ng their P  
 Right to B  
 church, for  
 ants of the  
 to be bap  
 infant's Fau  
 ant it very  
 of Parents  
 ir Children  
 and must th  
 Scotland de  
 and just Go  
 ose Throne  
 e over all hi  
 : answerable

let us further suppose that Infants do descend from  
 who are Members of the visible Church, but in their way  
 are as bad as any on this Side Hell; the Catechize gives  
 a Right to Baptism, because they are Members of the  
 church, altho' it refuses that Privilege to such as are the  
 of those who are no Members, tho' professing Faith in  
 and very sober in their Conversations, and only because  
 ants are no Members. Amazingly strange! that the In-  
 ber Professors, who are not Members of the visible  
 shall be without an Interest in the Covenant, when the  
 prophane Members shall be allowed that Interest: This  
 be the Kirk's Doctrine, but I will not advise any of the  
 to believe it, on the contrary my Advice to them is,  
 will solidly consider, and judge righteous Judgment.  
 I will now suppose, that Infants do descend from  
 do both profess Faith in Christ, and are Members of  
 Church, and to outward appearance do behave them-  
 they ought to do, but before God are the vilest Hypo-  
 the Heavens; if the Question be put, are those In-  
 vement? and have they a Right to Baptism? the Catechize  
 are in Covenant and have a Right; but shall we give  
 this Doctrine? shall we not rather choose to desire to be  
 om it? as a Doctrine so contrary to what was preach'd  
 the Conduct of an unerring Spirit, and so such, as on  
 thing we can have a more safe Dependance. If the Pedo-  
 baptsists would agree in Opinion with me in this, that the Kirk of  
 under a Mistake as to this Particular, and will own that  
 of such Hypocritical Parents are not in Covenant with a  
 whose teaching is, that if the Root be holy, so are the  
 and that the Hypocritical Profession made by Parents,  
 gives Infants no Right to Baptism more than what the Infants  
 themselves have; may I not then justly hope, that upon the  
 reason, they will also agree with me in Opinion, that  
 is not possible for the wisest Men on Earth to know who are  
 and who not, since it is one of God's incommunicable  
 secrets, to know the Heart of Man, and that consequently the  
 Church on Earth cannot tell, what Infants have a Right to  
 and what have not.  
 I will now suppose that Infants do descend from Parents  
 who are Unbelievers at the time of their Birth, but that one  
 of them is convinc'd of Truth, are converted and do be-  
 come Members of the visible Church; if it be made a Question,  
 whether Infants be in Covenant according to the Catechize,  
 and have a Right to Baptism? Perhaps the Pedobaptists deliberat-  
 ing on this, will come to this Conclusion; that the Catechize  
 does not determine the Case and therefore cannot determine the Answer,  
 since it is thus stated, the Infant at the time of it's Birth  
 is not a Member of the visible Church, and had neither of it's Parents  
 in Covenant with it, shall consider'd the Infant according to the first Part of  
 the

the Answer in the Catechize ought not to be baptiz'd upon Profession of Faith in and Obedience to Christ: But if it be tho' the Child had no Right at the Time of its Birth, because its Parents were not then Believers nor Church Members; yet that one Month after when the Parents became such, they had then a Right upon the Foot of their Faith and Church Membership; then it will follow that the first Part of the Answer to the Catechize is a general Rule to which there is an Exception: it must run thus, *None out of the visible Church should be baptiz'd upon Profession of Faith and Obedience—Except the Children of such as who are both or but one of them in the visible Church, and the other neither of them Members at the time of their Child's Birth; yet at what time soever they do believe and become Members, they then bring their Children into Covenant along with them, and give them a Right to Baptism.*

Well then I will suppose (but God forbid I should grant) that the Truth lies here, yet am I now at as great a Loss as ever to find a Satisfaction to my Mind upon this necessary Inquiry, how long is it before what Age of the Child the Parent's Faith shall retain its Force to bring it into Covenant and give it a Right to Baptism? I will then suppose the Child to be thirteen Years of Age (tho' *Ismael* when he was circumciz'd) before both or either of the Parents believe and become Members of the visible Church. Now the Question is whether the Faith of it's Parents at that Time of Life doth bring it into Covenant, and give it a Right to Baptism; if it be said it doth, then am I utterly at a Loss again to know what Occasion there is for that Faith and Obedience mentioned in the first Part of the Answer in the Catechize, or the first general Rule, since the Child can at any Age of Life plead it's Interest in the Covenant and Right to Baptism upon the Foot of it's Parents Faith without any such Personal Profession and Obedience: Nor can the Child not also plead his Right upon the Foot of his great Grandfathers Faith, since it must be granted that in Reference to the Promise of the Land of Canaan, to which Covenant Circumcision was fix'd as a Token and a Seal of the Righteousness of the Parents, it is remarkable in the Account of it, as to give his great Grandfathers and their great Grandchildren's Grandchildren at all Ages (until his promised Seed should come) an Interest in the Covenant and a Right to Circumcision, which was a Token and a Seal so that his great Grandchildren could say many hundred Years after *Abraham* was one and he inherited the Land, but we are now in the Land is given to us for an Inheritance. *Ezek. 33. 24.* Nothing be more clear than this, O ye Pedobaptists! If the Truth lies here, then the first general Rule in the Answer to the Catechize be thrown away, since a personal Profession of Faith in and Obedience to Christ is so manifestly unnecessary; in regard to any time of Life plead his Interest in the Covenant, and to any supposed Token or Seal of it, upon the Foot of his great Grandfathers Faith, tho' above a Thousand Years before he was born.

peradventure you may tell me, that notwithstanding *Abraham* with interested his great Grandchildren in the Covenant, yet that we must not run the Parallel between him and his Children, and Believers and their Children so far; but should conclude, that now under the Gospel, Children are in Covenant have a Right to Baptism, only upon the Account of their Parents Faith, and that not longer then until they are able to understand and make a Profession of Faith for themselves: If a Child be as old as *Ishmael* before his Parents become Members of the visible Church, his Baptism must be deferr'd, until he makes a Profession of Faith in, and Obedience to Christ: Well say the Pedobaptists! See what you are brought to now! for the Case to stand thus, then it must follow that the sense of the Answer in the Catechize is a general Rule to which there is an Exception, and so it appears in this Light: *Those who are Members of the visible Church are to be baptized—those who are capable to make a Profession of Faith for themselves.* If we consider'd, it will appear impossible to reconcile the Doctrine of *Scotland* with her self, I say to reconcile her Doctrine of Baptism with her Doctrine of Baptism, without a Multitude of supplementary Words or Sentences as [*that is*] or [*the meaning*] without this or the other Exception.

I will now suppose that Children do descend from Parents who are Believers and Members of the visible Church, and are in Covenant; shall I not be led into a just Surprize to find the Doctrine of *Scotland* is further inconsistent with her self upon this position, and if such Inconsistency shall fairly and honestly be lay'd open, may not all Men be astonish'd to observe, that a Confession should be compos'd by an Assembly of Learned and Instructed Divines, and a Catechize upon that Confession, which should obtain a Parliamentary Sanction, and meet with National Assent, and should be held in the highest Estimation by a Council of learned Men in two other Nations, and that not only in personal and private Capacities, but also in their *Synodical* making it a Test of *Orthodoxy*, accounting Men unsound who should refuse to subscribe to it as such, while the *Kirk of Scotland* should for so long a Time escape their Observation that the *Kirk of Scotland* is justly chargeable with this. It will yet be further manifest, when we compare her Catechize with another Part of her Catechize, where treating of the same Subject, instructing her Catechumens upon the Sense of her Confession, she conveys her Notion of the Covenant of Question and Answer, thus: *Q. Who was the Covenant made with? A. The Covenant of Grace was made with the first Adam, and in him with all the ELECT as his*

shall exercise our Thoughts as we are bound in Duty to do with a Desire to find out Truth upon those two different



terent and differing Places of the Catechize, and upon our we shall see what strange Doctrine we are furnish'd with, impossible it is to reconcile the Kirk with her self, (special her Doctrine of Election is taken into the Account; for be evident that she not only implicitly affirms the Salvation of Believers and their natural Seed, but also the universal Salvation of all Mankind, provided that be granted which I suppose will deny, viz. that Adam was a Believer.

Where a Man shall set himself to search for Truth, in this Catechize upon this single Question, Who was the Covenant of Grace made with? if he takes the Answer from that Part of the Catechize, where speaking of Infants Right to Baptism, the Answer is, *The Covenant of Grace was made with Believers and their natural Seed*: If the Answer be taken from that Part of the Catechize which relates to the Seventh Article, the Answer will be, *The Covenant of Grace was made with all the Elect as his Seed*, and if Truth be sought for upon those Questions, shall all the Elect be saved? or any but the Elect be saved? The Answers which the Catechize and Catechize gives to those Questions are, *All the Elect shall be saved and none shall be saved but the Elect*. Now admitting all the Answers to be right, and as before that Adam was a Believer, it will follow that all Mankind must be saved, as will appear by such Reasoning, as into which those Answers necessarily run as thus.

Adam was a Believer, therefore the Covenant was made with him and his Seed.

The Covenant was made with the Elect, and since it was made with Adam and his Seed, we thence conclude that Adam and his Seed are the Elect of God.

All the Elect shall be saved, Adam and his Seed are the Elect, wherefore evident, Adam and his Seed shall be saved. *trine*! and it plainly shews us that some one or other of the Answers must be false, from whence so great an Absurdity arises, and therefore it is the Duty of the Pedobaptists to pursue the Answer which is false, and purge the Catechize of it, it should be fairly cast, I know on what Part the Load lies. And surely all will own that those several differing Answers cannot be all true; consequently cannot be reconcil'd, unless the [that is] and [the meaning is] may help us. If it is true that Adam was a Believer, and as such the Covenant was made with him and his natural Seed, and so it is likewise made with Believers and their Seed, but not with all their Seed, then only as belong to the Election of God: Might not so the [that is] and [the meaning is] has reconcil'd her self, and seeing it is so, O ye Pedobaptists! it is your Duty, to which you have fairly brought your self, that the baptizing of Infants until you can find out those who according to your own Sentiments have a Right to Baptism.



can pick out of the natural Seed of Believers those In-  
do belong to the Election of God, because none but such  
venant.  
I may truly say I have thought of this and other Arti-  
Kirk of Scotland with a closer attention than many of  
s have done, I hope those who are reproachfully call'd  
Men are taking that Kirk's Articles into Consideration,  
es Men to do; and that the *old* and *true* Light will break  
t's Obscurity, from such their Considerations I am well  
ey are irreconcilable with themselves in several of their  
I could plainly demonstrate, but I have now nothing to  
any thing but what concerns the present Question, in  
nd it so very hard to bring them to bear with themselves  
nd *ands* and the [ *that is* ] and [ *the meaning is* ] will but  
ely do, and may I not say, when what is further offer'd  
d, neither *ifs* nor *ands* will do, for that it is not possible  
of Man to reconcile them with themselves; for let us  
ve that in the first Part of their Answer to the Question  
techize they say, that none out of the visible Church  
e baptized until they profess Faith in, and Obedience  
[ None out of the visible Church ] Surely these words  
at there are some in the visible Church who have a Right  
without such Profession and Obedience, and if we make  
on, Who are those who are in the visible Church? and  
ing in the visible Church have a Right to Baptism with-  
on &c. though it may be the Catechize will not furnish  
answer to this Question in exprefs Words, yet it may be  
the usual modern Method of Deduction, that is, by  
e, in it's Kind much like unto those Consequences which  
currently among the Pedobaptists, and so the Answer  
ly be, those Persons who are in the visible Church and  
nt to Baptism without Profession, are the Infants of be-  
ents. Mighty well, and are the Infants of believing  
eed in the visible Church? But which way in all the  
they get in? By what Gate or Door of Entrance? most  
most justly astonishing! There's no help for it, in  
d in they must be; but doth the Kirk of Scotland  
ve they're in? then how in the World can she be recon-  
self in the 28th Article of her Confession, where she  
one End for which Baptism was instituted was, that  
aptiz'd might be solemnly admitted into the visible  
rely. I take this Matter right, that the Kirk here teach-  
are in the visible Church until by Baptism they are  
mitted into it: How then got the Infants of believing  
without Baptism, and so as that they should have a  
ptism by vertue of their being in? If any Man in the  
reconcile those two Kirks together, that is, the Kirk  
nd the Kirk of Scotland, *alias* the Kirk of Scotland with  
will own he has got an Art which I am at present un-  
th.

For ought I know some ingenious Head-piece who ha  
educated in *Glasgow* or *Edinburgh* may reconcile those two *Scot*  
together, by bringing in, in proper Place [that is] and the  
of the Kirk of *Scotland* is in the Article of her Confession,  
End for which Baptism was instituted is, that all those  
out of the visible Church should by it be solemnly admit  
it; but the Infants of believing Parents who by vertue  
Parents Faith were in Covenant, and so in the visible Chur  
fore Baptism, they are out of the Case, and the Kirk doth  
that one End for which Baptism was instituted, was that  
should by it be solemnly admitted into it. Well then,  
Case stand thus, and so Infants are in the visible Church  
that without Baptism; what Occasion then is there for B  
the design of which is to bring them in that are out, in the  
of Indifferency then, let them stay in and keep Possession  
as they can, for we may be sure of this, that if there be a  
tian Discipline or Gospel Order in that Church in which  
in six or seven Years time they must be turn'd out again, w  
they grow up and begin to swear and curse and break the  
Day, and play such other Tricks as are not to be suffer  
Members of the visible Church, and when they are turn'd  
their bad way of living, then by the Rule of the Kirk i  
teachize, being out of the visible Church they will have no  
Baptism until they make a profession of their Faith in  
dience to Christ; if the Pedobaptists will walk accord  
Rule, and keep Infants unbaptiz'd until they make Pro  
themselves, then all will be well, but if they will not con  
this but will continue their Practice of baptizing Infants,  
be everlastingly inconsistent with themselves, and their  
of Pedobaptism will be eternally contrary to the Scriptur  
of Baptism.

When the Kirk of *Scotland* teacheth that none out of  
Church hath a Right to Baptism until a Profession of  
Christ, she teacheth the way of God in Truth, and h  
therein agrees with the holy Scriptures and the Sentime  
Church of Christ in the first and purest Ages of the C  
as Bishop *Beveridge* has well observ'd, the very Possess  
without the Profession of him, will give no Man a Right  
But when the Kirk teaches that the Infants of Belie  
Covenant and so have a Right, she herein advances  
to which the Apostles were intire Strangers, and asse  
she will never be able to prove by any part of divi  
I have turn'd to the several Texts of Scripture which  
me to in their Catechize, and have carefully consider  
and am very confident that not one of them do expre  
trine as they teach, neither contain it so as that by  
quence it may be deduced from thence, as for Gre  
Text on which I observe the Pedobaptists lay no Im

speaks of a Covenant which God made with *Abraham* and  
 I can with the greatest Freedom of Mind affirm that  
 without great Injustice to the Text, and to the Apostle  
 divine Expositor of it, be concluded that *Moses* in that  
 give any Account of any Covenant made by God with  
 and his NATURAL SEED, except only his Covenant  
 to give them the Land of *Canaan* for a worldly Inheri-  
 which Covenant I presume the Kirk of Scotland will not  
 any of her Children has an Interest further than as on fair  
 shall appear to be a natural Descendant from *Abraham*;  
 any other Covenant of which *Moses* may be suppos'd to  
 that Chapter, it must be accounted a spiritual Covenant  
 of Gospel Blessings, and the Heavenly *Canaan*, as an e-  
 rest to him and his SPIRITUAL SEED, in which Cove-  
 natural Seed simply consider'd as his natural Seed is not  
 rested. *John* the Baptist most evidently preaches this Doc-  
 the Jews. *Math. 3. 9.* *Think not to say within your selves we have*  
*to our Father,* and so plead your Interest in the Covenant  
 to Baptism on that Account, for I assure you that God is able  
 to raise up Children to *Abraham*, even of the Gentiles through  
 the Lord *Jesus*, who thereby becomes his Spiritual Seed  
 Family soever they be, and Heirs with him of the  
 nise. Spiritual Children who are Allegorically figured  
*Isaac*, who was a Child of Promise, and Typified all,  
 Nations throughout all Time should imbrace the Son  
 as the promised Seed of *Abraham*, and should be found  
 in the well pleasing Steps of *Abraham's* Faith, which was  
 ble to God, as that on the Account thereof, he made  
 father of the Faithful, and bestowed upon him all true  
 as his Spiritual Seed.  
 and *Jesus* in the 8th of *John* preaches this same Doctrine  
 who said ver. 33. *We are Abraham's Seed.* I know saith  
 ver. 37. *Ye are Abraham's Seed,* that is, *Abraham's* natural  
 ver. 39. *If ye were Abraham's Children,* that is, *Abraham's* Spiri-  
 ren, you would do the Works of *Abraham*, And ver. 44. *You*  
*father the Devil.* This Doctrine is that of which the Chris-  
 should be very tender because it is that which summe-  
 ins the whole Truth of the Gospel. Come ye Pedobap-  
 your Eyes with me on *Rom. 9. 8. 9.* and there learn that  
 not all *Israel* which were of *Israel*, neither because they  
 natural Seed of *Abraham*, were they his Children, for  
 his Seed was called, that is, they which are the Chil-  
 of the Flesh, these are not the Children of God, but the  
 of the Promise are counted for the Seed, hence *Gal. 4. 28.*  
 Brethren as *Isaac* was, are the Children of the Promise.  
 ver. 30. what saith the Scripture? *Cast out the Bond Wo-*  
*Man,* that is, the natural Seed whereof *Ishmael* was a Fi-  
 Son of the Bond Woman shall not be Heir with the Son of the  
 Mount *Sion* the true Gospel Church, or Spiritual *Je-*  
*rusalem,*



*Jerusalem*, which is the Mother of all true Believers, and this *Sion Sarah* simboliz'd, as *Agar* did *Mount Sinai*, a Mountain in where the natural Seed receiv'd the Law, under which they were in Bondage, and from which Bondage they refused to be made free.

The Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, the promised Seed of *Abraham* is the clearest Revelation which the great God hath made to Man, by which Life and Immortality are brought to Light. This Gospel is so full of this Doctrine, that true Believers on either side of the Sea, not their natural Seed are intitul'd to all the Promises of the Covenant; that upon the Authority thereof I can hold the Covenant of Promise whereof *Moses* speaks in the 17th of *Leviticus* was a Spiritual Covenant, and made with *Abraham's* Spiritual Seed only: I refer my self to, and am willing to be determined by the Apostle *Paul* in the 4th and 9th of the *Romans*. and the 3d of the *Galatians*, which will bring to this Conclusion, that the baptizing of the Kirk of *Scotland*, and all other the *Pedobaptists* most unnatural and unreasonable, in deducing an Interest in the Kingdom of *Heaven* to the natural Seed of true Believers, from that Interest which *Abraham's* Seed had in that Covenant of Promise which God made with him as the Heir of the World, and Father of the Faithful; and add further, that for them to continue the Practice of baptizing Infants, for which there is no manner of Necessity, thereby framing a Gospel Church of their natural Seed, is a Corruption, which alone must be composed of Spiritual Seed by the Word of God, *viz.* true Believers in Christ, they are erecting a second *Babel* whose Top will never reach the Heavens.

As the first *Baptist* zealously preach'd the necessity of this baptism, and our blessed Redeemer also did the same, as did the holy Apostles, who perpetually press for a Spiritual Work, and constantly shew that all Religious and Acceptable Ordinances are founded in a personal Persuasion and Exercise of the Mind. The *Baptists* do ever since hold themselves oblig'd to be true to this of this very tender Point; and as God hath made the Church the Pillar and Ground of this great Truth, and alone it has hitherto been supported, they believe it to be their incumbent Duty, from a Regard to the Glory of God, and the good of their Fellow Creatures, to contend earnestly for it, that the Ax of divine Justice is laid to the Root of the Church, such Trees as are but just peeping above Ground, whether good or bad, (such as are little Infants) but to the Root of the Church, as are well grown and able to bring forth good Fruits, they shall bring forth Fruits meet for Repentance; if such will not do what they are able to do, they shall be justly hewn down and cast into the Fire. I might enlarge very much upon this Subject, but the next and last Argument hath a further Relation to it, which I offer'd, I shall content my self and pass on.

My Reader may observe, I have advanc'd several Arguments to shew the ill Consequences attending the Doctrine



ing Infants, and the Inconveniencies into which it leads Communities, as, that it leads them into Confusion, putting it out of their with any tollerable Certainty to know, whether several of bers of those Communities were ever baptiz'd or not. ly, it puts them under a necessity of casting away Chris- tipline.

ly, it leads them into an absolute Inconsistency with

ly, it puts them under a Temptation to take up their Sa- in what was done for them in Infancy, without the ne- quiry whether they be right or wrong.

ch I heartily wish may be consider'd, as also I would uments may be, which are taken.

rom the Infant's Inability to perform a Covenant or Vow, ight to be made at Baptism.

y, those Arguments which are taken from the usefiness little Infants.

those taken from the want of holy Scripture to

y, those taken from the Contrariety thereof to the

those taken from it's being against the Opinion and the primitive Christians, in the earliest and purest Ages pel: And now I shall only add one Argument more, and ll submit the whole to the Chance or Lot, to which it bmitted.

## Argument the Twenty First.

trine which is in direct Contradiction to the Doctrine prophets and all the Apostles, is very unsound Doctrine. Doctrine of Infants Baptism, is in direct Contradiction rine of all the Prophets and all the Apostles:—

of God ke good the Minor Proposition, I further argue.

trine which makes Regeneration, or the new Birth, to something short of true Conversion, is contrary to the all the Prophets and all the Apostles.

Doctrine of Infants Baptism, doth make Regeneration, Birth to consist in something short of true Conversion:

of the Minor of this last Argument, I further argue:

trine which puts the great and wonderful work of Re- the new Creation of Man, but nine Months from a Doctrine which makes Regeneration to consist in ort of true Conversion.

But

But the Doctrine of Infants Baptism doth put the great  
 derful Work of Regeneration or the new Creation of  
 nine Months from Generation:—Therefore &c. as was to be  
 and which doth most manifestly prove, that Infants are re-  
 generated by Baptism, no nor at the time of their Baptism  
 Doctrine of Infants Baptism doth falsly teach, and is the  
 direct Contradiction to the Doctrine of all the Prophets  
 the Apostles.

The Church of *England* and *Ireland* in the 27th of the  
 faith, " Water Baptism is not only a Sign of Profession and  
 " of Difference, whereby Christian Men are discern'd from  
 " that be not Christned; but it is also a Sign of Regenera-  
 " the new Birth, whereby as by an Instrument, they that  
 " Baptism RIGHTLY, are grafted into the Church; the  
 " of the Remission of Sins, and our Adoption; to be  
 " God by the holy Ghost, are visibly Sign'd and Seal'd  
 " CONFIRMED, and Grace increased by Vertue  
 " to God.

The Kirk of *Scotland* in her 28th Article saith, " Ba-  
 " Sacrament of the new Testament, ordain'd by Jesus Ch-  
 " only for the solemn Admission of the Party baptized  
 " visible Church, but also to be unto him, a Sign and Se-  
 " Covenant of Grace; of his ingrafting into Christ; of  
 " tion and Remission of Sins; and of his giving up  
 " through the Lord Jesus Christ; to walk in Newness  
 " which Sacrament is by Christ's own Appointmen, to be  
 " in the Christian Church to the end of the World.

To the Truth of this Article of the Churches of *England*  
 and *Scotland* (believing we take their Sense of Words)  
 are called *Anabaptists*, can chearfully give our Consent;  
 persuaded it is agreeable to the Gospel, but must at the  
 declare, and in behalf of Truth insist upon it, that the  
 and Practice of baptizing Infants, is most demonstrably  
 to it; as being what cannot agree with the Description  
 nition, which both Kirks do give of Baptism in this Article.

Observe the Church of *England* saith, and she saith  
 it when RIGHTLY received, Faith is CONFIRMED  
 plainly supposeth the Party baptized should have Faith  
 it is impossible Faith should be confirm'd, where no Faith

Secondly, they say it is a Sign of Profession; but  
 not be a Sign of Profession in those, who neither do  
 any Profession; which makes it evident, that the  
 this Article gives of Baptism cannot answer to little  
 may to such as are personal Believers, or who are  
 believing.

The Kirk of *Scotland* saith, that Baptism is a Sign  
 giving up unto God, which supposeth that the Person  
 give himself up to God, through our Lord Jesus Ch-  
 true, but cannot answer to an Infant; in regard it is  
 is not able to do.

I observe, that both Kirks do agree in this, that Baptism is the Sign of Regeneration, which supposes that the Party baptized is regenerated by it, or regenerated when he receives it; and I am sure that it cannot be a Sign of Regeneration to any one, who is not regenerated; for first, Baptism doth not regenerate any: Secondly, it is not regenerated in Infancy, as I shall endeavour yet further to appear, and therefore must conclude, that the Doctrine and Practice of baptizing Infants, will not answer to the Article which gives of Baptism.

To understand the Popish Pedobaptists Notion rightly, they contend that the Infant is regenerated by Baptism; and some Protestants seem to me to run into the same way of thinking; others less mistaken in Judgment, will not have it that Baptism regenerates the Infant, but that the Holy Ghost regenerates by Baptism. If the differing Parties were to debate this between themselves, perhaps that Debate would entertain us with as nice Distinctions, as accompany the Arguments of *Transubstantiation*.

Primitive Christians, in the first Ages of the Gospel, call'd Baptism the Laver of Regeneration, and rightly they so call'd it, because they suppos'd the Persons they baptized were regenerated, in that the Sign of Regeneration appear'd in them, in that Profession which they made of Repentance and of their Faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, and that they not only consented to be baptiz'd, but desir'd it, as a solemn Vow or Covenant with God and his Church, to pursue a Godly Life, which would well become the Gospel to which they promis'd Subjection.

Those who are call'd Anabaptists, do look upon Water Baptism as the Laver of Regeneration still, because we admit none to be members of the Church, but such who give us the Signs of Regeneration, namely, Confessed Repentance and Faith, and their Promises which are of good Behaviour.

We are sometimes mistaken (even as were the Apostles) in that good Opinion we conceive of the Sincerity of the Person to whom we give this Sacrament, for we cannot look other than through the Eyes of Men, nor can we judge of Persons, but as we have a perfect Understanding of Men; for we pretend not to see the Hearts of our Fellow Creatures, to see that inward Regeneration which they give us the outward Signs.

At any time impos'd upon by any Person who disguises his Heart by putting on a Mask of Religion, conceals his Hypocrisy from us, whilst he seems to be what he really is not; we are not to think, that Water Baptism will do such a Man no good; on the contrary it will make his Sin the greater, for tho' he seems to be regenerated, yet the all-knowing God he cannot deceive. In short, it is always is, that Water Baptism is the Laver of Regeneration only to those who are truly regenerated; but that it is not

not so to such, who want that inward Grace whereof the Kirks of England and Scotland do say, it is an outward visible Sign.

It is true we always say, it is an outward Sign of Regeneration to those who are come to the Exercise of their Reason, capable of being regenerated; but that little Infants are not capable of the natural Understanding or the use of Reason, capable of being regenerated, and that therefore neither Baptism or any thing else be a Sign of Regeneration in them.

We may further observe, that as Baptism among the Ancients was called the Laver of Regeneration, so also it was called the Laver of Illumination, not because Baptism it self doth illuminate the Understanding; but because it was supposed, that the Persons were regenerated who sought for Baptism, and therefore Baptism was the Sign of their Illumination: To this Purpose Dr. Barlow Bp. of Exeter says, (saith he) "that in the first Ages they were first baptized, and then *Illuminati*; that is, they were first Catechized, and then baptized; which shews, that in the Opinion of the Ancients, Baptism was as *Illuminati*, and to them as good Reason as they accounted it the Laver of Regeneration, because it is evident, that Regeneration cannot be without Illumination; until the Mind be spiritually inlightened, the Soul cannot be regenerated; which clearly evidences this Truth, that Infants cannot be the Subjects of Illumination, they cannot be the Subjects of Regeneration.

Regeneration or the new Birth, is the Renovation or the Change of the whole Man, the renewing of the Mind, the affections and Will; it is the Conversion of the Man, to something which he was not before, and the making him a new Creature; in Fine, it is the doing away, and the making all things new, thro' the Operation of the Spirit of God upon the Soul.

Regeneration is the great and wonderful Work of God; it is a Work, in which Man is most justly requir'd to co-operate with God; a Work in which he must be a Co-worker with God. Man's Part, it results from the most serious and solid Consideration of things, and such things as are the most proper for Man's Meditation; such as God and Christ, Death, Judgment, the World to come, and the Salvation of the Soul from the Wrath, &c.

Regeneration is a Work, in which the Mind of Man is most hard; a Work, in which the Soul is more active than before; there is nothing about which Man's Mind is more busied, than the Pangs of the Soul in the new Birth, being right as to the Pains of a Woman in Travel; and the Struggles to come into the World from it's Mother's Womb: The Concerns of Man in his Conversion are most intent upon God, and weighty Concerns of his Soul; he is now full of



and, such as hath a peculiar Tendency to bring him to  
 a Sense of Sin, and the exceeding Sinfulness and Destruc-  
 tion thereof to the Soul, and the great and absolute Necessity  
 of entering into a Covenant with the Lord  
 in the most solemn Manner to make himself over to him,  
 heartily consenting to be saved upon those Terms, on  
 which the Lord Jesus Christ, he has made the Offers of  
 Salvation to Men.

Salvation consists in the Mortification of the Deeds of the  
 old Man, the Crucifixion of the Flesh, with all the vile Affections  
 thereof; in the Destruction of the Body of the Sins of  
 the old Man, the putting off the old Man with his Deeds, that is,  
 the Conversation or way of living, which was according to the  
 old Man, and in the putting on the new Man, or  
 the new way of living; a living to God in Righteousness  
 and Holiness.

It may persuade my self that all the understanding Gen-  
 tlemen of the Church of *England* and *Scotland*, will agree with  
 me, that the old Man cannot be put off, before it be put  
 on, being plainly impossible.

I made a Question, What is the old Man? I am inclin'd  
 to think all Parties will agree in this, or the like Answer; that it  
 is the Corruption of Man's Nature; and if it be ask'd at  
 what time it is, that we take up or put on this old Man, or at what  
 time the Corruptions of our Nature take hold of Mankind?  
 When we understand one another in Words, we shall  
 say, that we do put on the old Man, when Man's Nature

is ask'd, at what time it is that this Corruption of Na-  
 ture reveals itself, or puts itself forth in us, so as to be call'd  
 on, in the Scriptural Sense of it (*i. e.*) the old Conversati-  
 on. We bear the Image of the Earthly, as it stands oppos'd  
 to the Image of the Heavenly? I persuade my self all  
 men here too, that these Corruptions of Nature doth not  
 begin originally in a State of Infancy, before we know the Differ-  
 ence between Good and Evil. No Man puts on this old Man in  
 the Notion of putting it on, until he comes to that time  
 when the Law gets Power over him; until he is able to  
 obey the Law, and having Power, is justly requir'd to obey.  
 The Apostle *Paul* in the 7th of the *Romans* seems to teach  
 that he is alive without the Law, that is, so long as he is  
 not subject to the Law, but when the Commandment comes,  
 and gets Power over him and to bind him, then Sin revives  
 in him; then Man begins to die in Sin, and the Corrup-  
 tion shews it self, in his Rebellion and Disobedience

that the Corruption of Man's degenerated and degene-  
 rated Nature begins to appear (tho' not criminally) in our Child-  
 hood

hood, yea even in our Infancy, and the great Adversary of us takes as early advantage of our want of Understanding and want of Resistance, as possibly he can; most vigorously and persistently pursuing his malicious Design against us, unweariedly endeavouring to establish an Interest in us, while we are least acquainted with his Wiles; most solicitous to fix a lasting Friendship with us, to ruin our selves; and it may be observ'd by sad Experience, that a Compliance is too easily obtain'd, for that while we are young, we are not aware of his dangerous Devises and mischievous Intentions, in our Childhood utter Strangers to God and our Duty, and to that in which our greatest Good lies: So we are taken Captives by him at his own Will, and foolishly employ the Methods of our own Destruction.

This is a Doctrine, to the truth of which every Christian can find an Evidence in himself, that the Devil works upon our Ignorance of Mankind, as finding his Advantage therein, for the more a Man is ignorant, by so much the more he is kept in Subjection to him; he knows that a good and wise Man works upon Man's Understanding, and he never finds Pleasure in our Affections, nor has any Interest in our Will, until he takes possession of our Understanding, always working with us as rational Creatures, and in regard he has in his great Mercy distinguish'd us from other Creatures, endowing us with excellent and noble Faculties beyond what has been given to the whole Creation below, we most righteously expect we should use those Faculties, to the end of our Creation, that as we have Reason we should use it as becomes Men, to reason our selves into a religious and cheerful Compliance with the Will of so bountiful a Creator; our Judgment (being well inform'd) may direct our Will, and govern our Will, and determine it to the Choice of that which recommends to us for our greatest Good.

Now if this be a Doctrine to which our Assent must be given, that the Devil works upon our Ignorance, and a good and wise Man works upon our Understanding, then it must follow, that Ignorance first gets Possession of us, the Understanding and Will are all corrupted, before they be renewed, which is what I mean by our putting on the old Man before we put off it off.

In the Wickedness of our Lives appears the Degeneracy of our Nature, wherein we put our selves under the Dominion of our own Lusts, and suffer Sin and the Devil to tyrannize over us; in our Childhood the Corruption of our Nature reveals itself in Pride, Passion, Covetousness, and an over forwardness in the use of supposed Injuries done us, a greedy Desire of foolish Play things, by which the great Enemy of our Souls first corrupts our Affections, whilst the natural Understanding is so feeble to withstand him, and he finds his Account in

tions, knowing that in Childhood, the Affections only do the Will, and that the Affections corrupted, will dispose to that which is bad ; and so he strengthens his Interest in childish and foolish Passions, and as we grow up more towards the World, he makes it his Business to corrupt our Judgment, as knowing that he can but accomplish his Desire in this, he has made Advances towards the gaining his grand Design upon us ; in all the Wickedness of our Conversation, arises from a corruption and carnal Affections, which never fails to hurry us into such Words and Actions as are most disobliging to God, and most grateful to the Devil, and most destructive to our selves, the Fountain from whence flows all the Folly and Vanity which Youth is chargeable, such as Anger, Malice, Envy, Cruelty to Parents, filthy Communication, Lying, Swearing, Drunkenness, Adultery, and all kinds of Revellings, uttering the whole Man from the Life of God, through the Corruption of the Mind, and the Carnality of the Affections.

These things, and whatever else may be called the Works of the Flesh, do either all or some of them, domineer over every Man, after he passes the State of Infancy, and in the State of which, he puts on the old Man or corrupt Conversation, and is left under the Dominion of his Lust, and in Thralldom to Satan ; in Enmity with God, and in Rebellion against him, and in this most unhappy and miserable State, he continues till the Law of the Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus, shall make him free from the Law of Sin and Death.

In the House of our Bondage, in the Degeneration of our pure Nature, we are held as in Chains of Iron and Brass; but by Regeneration or the new Birth through the Assistance of the Spirit of God, we put off this old Man with his Deeds, and so leave our sinful Conversation in some good Measure, and bear part in a Spiritual Warfare, inlisting our selves in the Service of Christ, becoming his Soldiers and Swearing Allegiance to him, resolving to fight under his Banner, maintaining a holy War against the World and our own Corruptions, until Sin and Satan are subdued and brought under the Feet of Christ, the Victory of our Salvation, by whose Strength alone we can do it. With these Qualifications, we enter the River with Christ, and are sacramentally bury'd with him in that liquid Grave, then we receive Baptism be to us the Laver of Regeneration ; not a Laver which regenerates Souls, but a Laver in which regenerated Souls are washed ; and in which they wash away their Sins, calling to mind the Name of the Lord. *Acts* 2. 37. 38. and 22. 16. then will Baptism be an Illumination to us ; not that Baptism simply in it self, doth illuminate any, but will be an Evidence of our Conversion, at least an outward Sign of it. According to the saying of St. James, *Faith is made perfect by Works*, and Works of Obedience to Christ are the clearest Evidences of our Faith in him,

even



even as also our Love to him, exactly agreeing with the  
of *Basil* the great, mentioned before, viz. *Faith is perfected by  
and Baptism is founded upon Faith.*

Regenerated Souls by Baptism, are planted together with  
in the Similitude both of his Death and Resurrection; for  
being covered all over, or plunged into the Element of Water  
figured forth as by a lively Emblem, the Death and Burial  
Christ; and which also Mystically figures forth the Death and  
rial of the Corruptions of our degenerated Nature, as in his  
and by our being raised up out of the Water by the Holy Spirit,  
the Administrator, is represented not only the Resurrection of  
Lord Jesus, but our Resurrection with him from the Grave,  
Sin, in which before Regeneration we were bury'd; there  
is figur'd forth our Resurrection with him to a new and better  
through Faith of the Operation of God, that as Christ be-  
ed from the Dead dieth no more, Death hath no more Dominion  
over him, so we being risen with Christ, should seek those things  
that are above; being once Dead, and our Lives being united to  
Christ in God, we should die no more in Sin, we should lay  
again the Foundation of Repentance from dead Works; and  
ing once laid it, should pass on to Perfection, *Col. 2. 12.*  
1. 2. *Col. 3. 1.*

Having thus far proceeded, I shall hope that all the Persons  
who are piously inclin'd, and who lying open to Conviction,  
heartily willing to embrace the Truth as in the Lord Jesus  
receive it upon it's own Recommendation, and that in Love  
to it, and the Glorious Author of it; I say, I have Hoped  
will be persuaded to consider, what I have offer'd on this  
Subject of Regeneration; the Regeneration of our degenerated  
ture, without which, we vainly look for Happiness, and  
Consideration will incline them to believe, that little or none  
whom appears not (in a criminal Sense) the Marks of Regene-  
racy, are not capable of Regeneration, which consists in a  
version, and stands at a greater Distance from Generation  
their Doctrine of Infants Baptism doth put it: Moreover  
impossible that Baptism should be the Laver of Regeneration  
them; nor indeed can possibly be so much as a Sign of Rege-  
neration in them, and in Regard all Parties do call it a Sign of  
neration, and of Ingrafting into Christ, and of an Interest in  
Covenant of Grace, and of Remission of Sins; there is no  
can have a Right to it in the Sight of God, but he who is  
regenerated, and most certainly born from above; neither  
Person a Right to it in the Sight of Men, but he in whom  
seen the outward Marks or Signs of Regeneration, and who  
seem to be what the Ministers, and Church of Christ in  
Judgment of Christian Charity suppose them to be.

I shall also hope, that where these things are carefully  
didly weigh'd, and all Prepossessions and Prejudices are



all meaning Souls will come into my Opinion, that the  
of Infants Baptism, which puts Regeneration but nine  
from Generation, and the new and second Birth but eight  
from the first or old Birth, is a Doctrine which makes Re-  
generation to consist in something short of true Conversion; and  
is manifestly contrary to the Doctrines of all the Prophets,  
the Apostles, and that in Consequence thereof, little In-  
crease of the Subjects of Christian Baptism.

*If TRUTH in these Lines do appear,*

*Tho' no Man should receive it;*

*I have done my Duty, I am clegr,*

*So well content, I leave it.*

F I N I S.



...will come into my opinion, that the  
...Baptism which has been  
...and the new and second birth  
...of old kind, is a Doctrine which makes  
...in coming from of this Convention, and  
...contrary to the Doctrine of all the Prophets,  
...and that in consequence thereof, this is  
...of Christian Baptism.

TRUTH is the only way to  
...the only way to  
...I have said, I have said,  
...I have said, I have said.

FINIS

